India

FOR THE

No. 29. New Series.
No. 123. Old Series.

WEEK ENDING FRIDAY, JULY 22, 1898.

Registered as a Newspaper. | Price...... 2d. By Post, 2½d.

Notes and News 33
The Treatment of the Natus 36
The Cant of "No Party" 37
Sir Richard Meade, by Professor A. F. Murison, LL.D. 38
The Delhi Mutiny 40
Our London Letter 40
Chronicle of the Week 41
Expansion beyond the North-West Frontier: Mr. Thorburn's Speech at Simla 42
Wanted: Parliamentary Control ... 43
India in Parliament 45
The Death of Dr. Sircar: European Soldiers Sentenced 46
Advertisements 47-48

NOTES AND NEWS.

LORD GEORGE HAMILTON may be able to congratulate himself on the big majorities which in the present House of Commons endorse his roseate views of Indian finance. He may even be able to hide from his friends in England the real truth of the situation. But he has conspicuously failed to enlist the support of those who have a competent knowledge of India, however anxious they may be to uphold the Government. Thus it is that we find the Anglo-Indian Press, generally so ready to paint the state of India under English rule in the most glowing colours, unable to accept the absurd optimism of the Secretary of State. Last week we reprinted from the *Pioneer* an article headed "India Office Superlatives." But this does not stand alone. The same line of criticism is taken up by the *Times of India*. In fact, for all those who know the financial condition of India, the attempt to represent a country with a growing debt, and a taxation that it almost passes the wit of man to increase, as financially prosperous is too grotesque for the most devoted friends of Government in India.

The surprise of the *Times of India* is naturally increased by this outburst of Lord George's exultation, which "arouses admiration for his courage rather than for his judgment," having been made on a motion for adding to the Indian debt, however much this confidence was necessary for the justification of Sir James Westland. Our contemporary continues:

> That he would endeavour to put a favourable complexion upon a not very reassuring position was only to be expected; but we were not prepared—and, we imagine, hardly anyone either in India or in England was prepared—for the positive jubilation which was the key-note of the speech. The very nature of the motion which formed the peg upon which the address was hung ought to have precluded any undue expressions of satisfaction upon the condition of the finances of this country. If the Secretary of State thinks the present moment favourable for a gleeful contemplation of the situation, he enjoys a monopoly of conviction unique in Ministerial utterances. Were his protestations respecting the stability of India's resources to be taken as absolutely sincere, he might be described as occupying a position of light-hearted isolation. We suspect, however, that they were dictated by a keen appreciation of the realities of the position, rather than by the inspirations of genuine conviction; much as the cry, "We will never surrender," from a nation at war invariably heralds overtures for peace.

This is indeed an ominous comparison. Few will fail to agree that "Lord George Hamilton's ill-timed optimism will not command general acceptance."

On another page will be found the best report which we have been able to procure of the significant speech delivered by Mr. Thorburn at Simla on June 28 upon the "forward" folly beyond the North-West frontier. So far as we can discover, none of the Anglo-Indian journals has reported Mr. Thorburn fully, which seems odd, though perhaps it is not. By the same mail—the last—come rumours that fresh trouble beyond the border is impending. "There is no doubt," the *Civil and Military Gazette* of Lahore appears to think, "that the feeling in the Upper Punjab is that a storm is brewing on (*sic*) the frontier. The bazaars are full of rumours, and Government, despite all its endeavours, cannot keep its precautions entirely secret. . . . . A good deal is being done quietly and without fuss. Arsenals are busy and so forth. If a disturbance happened any moment in Tochi or Bajaur, it would surprise but few: and Bajaur, if it rose, would very likely carry Swat with it." We mention these rumours for what they are worth. The *Pioneer*, it may be worth noting, dismisses them as absurd. But if anyone believes that we have reached the end of the troubles brought upon India by the "forward" policy, he is capable of believing anything.

It is stated in the *Times of India* that of the rifles lost by the troops or carried off by deserters during the campaign beyond the North-West frontier, no very great number remain in the hands of the tribesmen. However, lest perhaps we should be too much elated at this, we find in the same column two ominous items of news. The first, headed "The Traffic in Arms on the Frontier," tells of the capture of another Afridi with arms and ammunition which he intended to carry over the border. The second is an even more serious matter, the murder of a sentry of the Guides by rifle thieves who, leaving him with thirteen wounds, escaped with his rifle; and in this case no clue to the thieves has been obtained. It is evident we are still a long way from the promised disarmament.

When news of the violent death of Dr. Sircar at Barrackpur was telegraphed to us by a correspondent at Calcutta, and the matter continued to be ignored by the correspondents of the daily newspapers, we ventured to ask, not for the first time, upon what principles Reuter's agents in India and the Anglo-Indian correspondents of the *Times* determined their selection of topics for messages home. We wondered whether their silence was in any way connected with the fact that the victim of the crime was a distinguished and widely respected Indian physician, and the persons charged with having done him to death were British soldiers. Our curiosity upon this point is increased by the publication in last Friday's newspapers of a Reuter's telegram announcing the murder of an English railway engineer by Pathans. If the one case was worth reporting, why not the other? Discrimination of this kind, especially when it always discriminates so as to conceal charges against Englishmen, naturally encourages Indians to think that the correspondents of the English Press do not impartially collect news in India for home consumption, but, while they give prominence to anything which may tend to throw discredit upon the Indian population, habitually overlook similar misconduct upon the part of Englishmen. This, as we have urged before, is a matter which English editors have it in their power to deal with, and we are glad to see that the *Star* has put a plain question to Reuter's Agency upon it. As we go to press a telegram (which will be found at p. 46) reaches us from our Calcutta correspondent stating that the European soldiers charged with the murder of Dr. Sircar have been found guilty, by a special jury of Englishmen, of causing grievous bodily hurt, and sentenced to rigorous imprisonment for seven years.

The *Manchester Guardian* of July 12 published a translation of a circular issued by the Russian Minister of the Interior upon the more effective treatment of "politically untrustworthy persons." "The Russian police," said the *Guardian* in a leading article, "are to look out for agitators and, having caught one, they are to search him. If proofs can be found against him, he is to be tried and sentenced; if no proofs are forthcoming, he is to be sentenced without being tried, or, as it is delicately put, 'according to the rules of the state of seige'." Whereupon Mr. Romesh Dutt wrote to the editor of the *Manchester Guardian* asking whether these remarks were not equally applicable to the new law of sedition in India. His letter was printed in that journal on July 14, together with this editorial comment:

> A well-known Indian living in England asks us to-day whether all that we said the other day in condemnation of the Russian Government's way of dealing with "politically untrustworthy persons" does not apply with equal force to the Indian Government's short

way with editors. It does. The new sedition law is perfectly Russian in its spirit. It has been our own complaint against it that it brings into India methods of repression which all Englishmen regard, when they see them practised in Russia, as odious and contemptible. To give India a humane and scientific code of law we employ men like Macaulay and Stephen, and then, in a passing panic we throw away their handiwork and go back to the use of the old instruments of half-civilised despotisms. It is as if English weavers tried to cope with a period of bad trade by going back to the hand-loom. Worse still, there is something pointedly infatuated in a policy which drives it home into the minds of Indians that, harsh as Russian rule is, British rule may be no better. The authors of this policy are never tired of telling us that Russia menaces India. Their whole military policy is one of nervous preparation to keep Russia out. In their wisdom they do what they can at the same time to make Indians feel that they might be no worse off if Russia got in.

The organisation of Press Committees in Indian districts for the purpose of watching and reporting on newspapers is in keeping with the narrow and suspicious policy which at present finds favour with the Government. The most loyal Indian papers condemn this Russian method as hurtful and intolerable. The *Indian Spectator* justly remarks: "The policy of a perpetual espionage, of constant intermeddling and fussy attempts to shape in a particular direction the lines on which journals shall be conducted is a policy which can hardly be deemed to be a satisfactory one." When the Government of the country descends to such methods of espionage we can scarcely wonder if Anglo-Indian journals, never friendly and sympathetic towards the natives of India, exhibit unusual rancour. They have made themselves, says the *Champion*, "the self-constituted censors of the Vernacular Press." Their method is described as "taking up a sentence here and a word there, absolutely detached from its context, . . . twisting its meaning, and attempting to build thereon a charge of sedition." It is quite certain that the attitude of hostility assumed by English journals in India towards the people does more harm to the British Empire in the East than all that Indian papers have ever written.

The Rev. W. G. Peel has discovered the real cause of the plague. Preaching recently in Bombay Cathedral, on a day appointed for thanksgiving and humiliation, he set himself to enquire for which of our sins the plague was sent by the Almighty, and he had no difficulty in arriving at the conclusion that the Hindus had been so afflicted because the English in India had tolerated idolatry. This may seem a somewhat vicarious form of punishment, and rather hard on the Hindus. But what are we to think of the preacher who in this age calls for a new era of religious persecution? As reported in the *Advocate of India*, he said: "God had not given us India to preserve idolatry in its strongholds and to secure religious freedom for what we are obliged to call false faiths." The heavy charge at which India has to support an alien church is not enough for Mr. Peel. He is not satisfied that his church receives the money of the impoverished people of India, who do not belong to it. He goes further and urges the Indian Government to begin a crusade against the old religions of the country, in defiance of the most solemn pledges, and at the risk of the most frightful suffering, though he expressly repudiates any wish to have the idolaters "exterminated." To such madness can Anglo-Indians come in a time of excitement and panic.

We take the following from the *Pioneer Mail* of July 1:—

A new plague order has been issued by the Madras Government in which the scope of the regulations for city and mofussil is explained. Segregation is declared to be absolutely necessary, but the wishes of the people are to be consulted in all the arrangements. Medical treatment is not to be forced on unwilling patients, and women are under no circumstances to be examined by men. Inoculation is to be perfectly optional. Quarantine is set aside in favour of observation—that is to say, travellers entering Madras will not be detained wherever they may come from, unless actually suffering from plague; but those coming from known affected areas will be kept under observation for ten days, being free, however, in the meantime to go where they please.

This is an interesting sign of the relaxation of the plague measures. But it also suggests the questions (1) has inoculation been compulsory anywhere? and (2) have women anywhere been examined by men?

Opinion is still divided in Calcutta as to whether the plague epidemic has really spread to that town. One learns from the *Statesman* that, when the mail left Calcutta, a requisition was in course of signature calling upon the Sheriff of Calcutta to convene a public meeting at the Town Hall with the object of associating professional and unbiassed opinion with the Government in diagnosing the nature of "what are styled suspected plague cases." On the other hand, one learns that up to the last Monday in June there were altogether 147 seizures in the town, and the number of deaths was 109.

The Indian papers received by the last mail are full of the currency question, and their remarks deserve notice because they deal with the matter, not from the point of view of the Secretary of State and the Finance Minister who are anxious to adjust the budget, nor from that of European traders who desire to see a constant ratio between the rupee and gold, but solely from the point of view of the people of India. In India, these journals urge, it is not the custom with the poorer classes to deposit their small savings in banks; they invest them in silver bangles and ornaments for their women. By closing the mints the Government, it is contended, has confiscated much of the value of these savings of the poor, and the evil will be increased if a gold standard is introduced.

The point is well put by the *Tribune* in a passage which it may be worth while to reproduce for our English readers:—

Where is the reserve wealth—in other words the savings—of the country? In its silver ornaments. The zenanas of India are a standing monument to the thrift of the population. They represent its Savings Bank, the little hoards scraped together with infinite patience, virtue, and self-denial, and put by for a rainy day: and many of these little hoards were *melted down from the Government of India's own rupees.* When the rainy day comes, and the thrifty peasant has perforce to fall back on his little hoard, what is it worth? Just two rupees for each three he put away, because the mint is closed! Conceive the feelings of those who have learnt the extent of their loss by bitter experience! Government, which has taxed the soil they live by, and the salt which savours their food and is necessary for their health, is still not content. It must tax their thrift. Such a thing could not happen in England. No Ministry there would dare, by a stroke of the pen, to mulct by one-third the savings of the people deposited in the national Savings Banks. The savings of India are deposited in its zenanas, and the currency policy of the Government of India has decreased the value of these savings by 33⅓ per cent.

Another evil effect of a gold standard which the Indian papers deplore is a scarcely veiled increase of taxation throughout the country. The poor cultivator who pays his rent and the taxpayer who pays his taxes in rupees, will, it is contended, have to pay the same number of rupees of an enhanced value, and the millions of impoverished cultivators who are indebted to money-lenders and others in rupees will find their debts covertly increased by the policy of the Government.

In the *Economist* (July 16) a correspondent, "Single Standard," sets out seven cardinal points in regard to which he claims that the Currency Committee's report must "not fail to satisfy the public mind." Apart from those points which are addressed to bimetallists—and being mainly hypothetical may be left to them—this writer's 1, 3, and 4, raise the gravest question and strike at the root of the matter as one of political good faith and sovereign obligations. Here is a point that has been asked in the Indian Press again and again, but has not been faced by Sir James Westland or anyone else: "If the Government of India [*i.e.*, the British Cabinet] substitutes a gold for the existing silver standard currency in that country, is it not bound to *bear the cost* of such change at whatever ratio established?" Obviously this is unanswerable except in the affirmative. In his point 3 the writer applies this proposition to "the chief factor of that country's fiscal system, *i.e.*, the land revenue," and remarks that those who pay that revenue—we add cultivating rayats included—can demand "specific performance of contract." This, also, which has been raised by every independent writer on the subject, has been and is still being shirked—for anything that is known of the Committee's proceedings. Point 4 states the obviously "logical and legal necessity for the Indian treasuries to redeem all silver rupees presented within a given time, by the issue of legal standard gold coin in lieu thereof." This query also admits only of one answer. It has indeed been, so to speak, dawdled over incidentally in the Simla mandate; but no serious attempt has been made to offer any practical answer. These are factors that lie on the

surface of this [illegible]ous problem. Has the Committee tackled them to [illegible]gin with? We and millions more pause for a reply.

There are some points in the General Order dealing with soldiers' shooting passes which deserve attention. It is evident that the number of cases of reckless or violent shooting which have occurred has impressed on the authorities the necessity of greater strictness if they are to be checked. It is obvious, as the order says, that a few days' confinement to barracks or the loss of the privilege of shooting has no effect. What is still more important is that the authorities seem at last to see the necessity of making the officers responsible for the good conduct of their men. Thus the order concludes with these remarkable words: "Any officer who by undue leniency fails to properly appreciate the gravity of offences such as those under notice will incur the commander-in-chief's grave displeasure." This is a move in the right direction. Callousness and recklessness in the men will never be put down if they are not repressed by the example and authority of the officers; and until the officers take a more just and generous view of their relations with the Indians it is too much to expect any great change in the attitude of the rank and file, whose worst offences are often only a rough translation of their officers' real feelings into the acts of ignorant men.

We congratulate Mr. Mehta on his re-election to the Supreme Legislative Council. Mr. Mehta's previous services to his countrymen as a member of the same Council are well known, and Bombay could not have made a better selection. "He is by far the fittest man amongst us," says the *Indian Spectator*, "but gratifying as are his services, and the reward that he gets for them, equally at the hands of the people and the Government, again and again the reflection comes to pain the mind, that he is probably the only man amongst us at present." This, we should hope, is an unduly despondent view, but it indicates Mr. Mehta's pre-eminence.

Sir James Lyall is reported to be now at Simla, engaged in the preparation of the report of the Famine Commission. The scope of the Commission's enquiry was so limited that we can expect little that will be practically useful from its labours. Nevertheless we await the report with interest. Meanwhile Sir James Lyall has, we are glad to find, won golden opinions in India by the way in which he has performed his task. "In cross-examining witnesses," says the *Tribune*, "he has been always anxious to elicit statements and facts likely to help those to whom relief has to be given, while his abundant and unfailing courtesy to his colleagues has been warmly appreciated."

The Hon. Mr. Crole has done a public service in calling attention to the condition of the cultivator under private zemindars in the Madras Presidency. Madras must be sadly deficient in protective land laws (like the Bengal Land Acts of 1859, 1868, and 1885) if the zemindars have so long been allowed to practice a regular system of rack-renting on their cultivators. According to Mr. Crole's informant the rents in the zemindaris are Rs. 10 to Rs. 30 an acre (water-tax included) for wet lands, and Rs. 5 to Rs. 10 for dry lands, against Rs. 6 to Rs. 10 for wet lands, and Rs. 1 to Rs. 4 for dry lands in Government villages. The Rájá of Bobbili, who represents the zemindari interest in the Madras Council, does not admit the accuracy of the figures, but he admits that the existing land laws of Madras require reform.

The visit of Lord Sandhurst, Governor of Bombay, to the native State of Mysore has plainly given great satisfaction to the people of the State. His Excellency was welcomed on June 18 by the Dewan and Councillors of Mysore, by the palace deputation, and by the deputation of municipal commissioners. There was a State dinner, and His Excellency is reported to have made a speech highly complimentary to the administration of Mysore under the guidance of Her Highness the Maharani. Lord Sandhurst inspected the Oriental Library, received an address in Sanscrit, and paid a visit to the Maharani and inspected the State jewels. On the 20th he visited the Girls' School and paid a visit to the minor Mahárájá. On the whole, the visit seems to have created a pleasant impression.

Lord Sandhurst's new policy with regard to the educational institutions of Bombay may raise a smile. The Government has the authority to sanction new colleges that are opened. But hitherto this authority has never been used, the action of the Senate being virtually considered final. Lord Sandhurst now seeks to exhume the obsolete power, and sanctions the Elphinstone College with retrospective effect "from September 4, 1860." That is to say, a college which has been in existence for thirty-eight years now receives the august sanction of the Government. Other existing colleges and institutions are similarly sanctioned, some permanently and some to the close of this year, while sanction has been refused in the case of two. The object of this strange policy is apparently to obtain a firmer hold on educational institutions. Even the *Indian Spectator* remarks: "this fussy interference would end in a reaction, or at least create by provocation that very spirit of opposition—say 'ill-will'—which it would seem to be the object" of the Government to avoid.

We referred recently to the Lord Mayor's glowing account of his anticipations of support to the Indian Heroes Fund, based on his estimate of British appreciation of the Indian troops. Now, what do the military authorities in India say? The *Pioneer* lately published a letter citing the case of a Sikh—and the Sikhs have been very much to the fore—"who had put in thirteen years' exemplary service, including two campaigns." On this case the *Pioneer* remarks justly:—

> The man lost his right arm in the recent operations on the frontier, and is now, it seems, eligible only for a second-degree wound pension of Rs. 5 a month. In such a case, as our correspondent points out, such a pension is totally inadequate. Either the scale of wound pensions should be revised, or a special fund should be set apart which the Commander-in-Chief can draw upon in particular cases.

In connexion with this point, it may be interesting to recall a fact in the history of the Irish adventurer George Thomas, who, in 1798, ruled Hariana from Hansi. Says Mr. Herbert Compton:—

> Very early in his rule he instituted a system of pensions and compensations for his soldiers, and those who were wounded in his service received sufficient for their wants, whilst half of the pay of their rank was granted to the widows and children of men killed in action. These liberal provisions absorbed a sum of Rs. 50,000 a year, which was more than a tenth of Thomas's entire revenue—a proportion far in excess of that allotted to such philanthropical purposes even in the most civilised countries.

Not that Thomas had not other uses for the money, as well as modern rulers. At this very time, he says himself, "I wished to put myself in a capacity, when a favourable opportunity should offer, of attempting the conquest of the Punjab, and aspired to the honour of planting the British standard on the banks of the Attock!"

Indian papers received by the last mail bring us news of the death of Mr. Dwarka Nath Ganguli, one of the strongest supporters of the Indian National Congress, and one of the pioneers of Indian educational and social reform. It is not generally known that his wife, Mrs. Ganguli, was the first Bengali lady to pass the B.A. examination of Calcutta University, the first to qualify herself in India as a lady doctor, and the first to win medical diplomas in this country. We deeply regret the loss which India has sustained by Mr. Ganguli's death.

All who are acquainted with public men in Western India, and those who met the Indian Chiefs and notabilities at the Jubilee gathering, will regret to hear of the death of Sir Jamsetjee Jeejeebhoy. Though less conspicuous in such deeds of public munificence as those which still commemorate the two former Parsee baronets, the third Sir Jamsetjee (his own name being Manekjee Cursetjee) has fulfilled the duties of his position with perseverance, judgment, and impartiality, alike in the City Corporation and in the Legislative Council. A man of amiable disposition, without ambition in commerce or political affairs, he had a smoother career than his predecessors, and than his energetic uncle Rustamjee Jeejeebhoy, who was in the earlier sixties a man to be reckoned with in the Bombay community. The deceased baronet will be succeeded by his son Cursetjee.

THE TREATMENT OF THE NATUS.

When a Government undertakes so arbitrary a proceeding as the imprisonment without trial of two of its citizens and the attachment of their property, it is at least desirable that the necessity of such action should be clear and the alleged motives consistent, and that it should be carried out in the most exact conformity with the law. It is also desirable that in carrying it out as little harshness should be shown as possible, and that care should be taken in striking at the guilty that no injury come to the innocent. It has always been held, even in the worst times, that the power of imprisonment without trial was a dangerous one, to be carefully and jealously watched. Therefore it is needless to offer any apology for referring again to the strange case of the Natus, in which we do not hesitate to say that the Indian Government has violated every one of the conditions enumerated above, the strictest observance of which can alone make such arbitrary proceedings tolerable.

As all will remember, the two Natus were arrested nearly a year ago—on July 28, 1897—under the Bombay Regulation XXV of 1827. They were thrown into prison and kept there till May, 1898, when they were taken to Belgaum and "released," with the condition that they were to remain in that place, and under threats of further punishment if their conduct should displease the authorities. The day after their arrest their property, both movable and immovable, was attached, the former being set free at the end of last year, but the latter being until quite recently, if it is not still, in the hands of the Government, who made the brothers a monthly allowance. Now it seems obvious that the conduct of the Government in the matter of the Natus violates every one of the conditions under which alone such arbitrary powers can be exercised without the greatest danger. It has never yet been shown that the tranquillity of the country was threatened by the Natus. Several different and inconsistent accounts of the reasons for their arrest have been given. It is tolerably certain that the Government had no legal warrant for attaching the joint property of the Natu family, in which a third brother, against whom no charges were made, was interested. And not only did this attachment of property cause much trouble to innocent persons, but the changing series of charges brought against the prisoners by Lord George Hamilton must have increased, and that most unnecessarily, the pain and anxiety of their position.

The case of the Natus has been often discussed in these columns, and it is not now our intention to deal with anything save certain legal aspects of the question, which are referred to in a petition lately addressed by a brother of the two Natus to Lord Sandhurst, the Governor of Bombay. Among several points urged in this petition we select three: (1) How far was it proper to threaten the Natus with further ill consequences if their future conduct gave offence to the Government? (2) Was the attachment of their property legal? (3) What possible justification could be pleaded for the attachment of property in which the third brother had an interest? Each of these points deserves examination in turn.

(1) The Government, in releasing the Natus, or rather permitting them to reside in their houses at Belgaum, thought proper to warn them as to their future behaviour, and the dire consequences that would result from any failure of good conduct. Now, by this it can hardly be meant that if they are guilty of crime they will be placed on their trial in the ordinary courts; for this is true of every inhabitant of British India as much as and no more than it is true of the Natus. Nor would the Government have any power in such a case to dictate to the court either the penalty to be exacted in case of conviction, or the weight to be given in deciding on that penalty to the previous record of the prisoners. It must, therefore, be assumed that the Government, in case of misconduct on the part of the Natus, intended to proceed against them under Regulation XXV. But this can only be enforced for certain specified reasons—the due maintenance of alliances, the preservation of tranquillity in the territory of Native Princes, and the security of the British dominions from foreign hostility and internal commotion. Thus, whatever their conduct—for the ot... specified reasons are beside the mark—their re-arrest could only be justified if it was necessary to secure the British dominions against internal commotion. In other words, their re-arrest could only be justified on the same grounds as their original arrest, or as the arrest of any other person under the Regulation, and therefore the warning was a mere impertinence.

(2) In Regulation XXV the imprisonment of persons and the attachment of property are dealt with separately. The one does not follow as a necessary result of the other. Nor, it would appear, is the attachment of property to be enforced as a penalty. On the contrary, under this Regulation property is only to be attached when the management is dangerous to the peace and order of the locality, and not because of the crimes of its owner. Now, to take only one instance, among the immovable property of the Natus was a *chawl* in the town of Bombay, let out to tenants, their relations with whom consisted only in the receipt of rents. How could it be pretended that their retaining this *chawl* would be dangerous to the peace and order of Bombay? Moreover, attachment under the Regulation was only to be temporary, and according to the usual interpretation of permissive laws, was to cease "whenever the management of the estate can be committed to the hands of the proprietor without public hazard or inconvenience." It is not enough to answer that the rents obtained might have been spent in forwarding evil designs elsewhere. The Regulation only contemplates the attachment of property as arising from some ill effects directly resulting from the administration of the property. But can it in any case be pretended that "public hazard or inconvenience" would result if the Natus were allowed to receive the rents of their property in Bombay city? And if not, why is this property still subject to restraints?

(3) But a much more obvious illegality remains, and one which, as it strikes at the rights of those who are admitted to be innocent, is still more damaging to the reputation and good faith of those who have perpetrated it. Of the immovable property attached one portion, situated in the Native State of Sangli, was held by the eldest of the three brothers, the Sirdar Balwant Ramchandra Natu, in trust for his son-in-law; the rest of the immovable property attached was held jointly by the three brothers who at the time of the arrests formed a joint and united Hindu family. Now it must be remembered that against the third brother, Sadashiva Ramchandra Natu, no charge whatever has been made by the Government. Lord George Hamilton, so prolific in varying and inconsistent accusations against the elder brothers—from murder to decreasing the employment of a certain midwife—has had nothing to say against the youngest, nor has his personal freedom been in any way interfered with. On what ground, then, was this innocent man deprived of his property and put upon an allowance fixed at the arbitrary discretion of the Government? The law has provided that where property is held jointly, a partition must be made and the claims of innocent holders satisfied before an attachment can be carried out. Why was not this done? Moreover, the movable property of the family was also attached, though the Regulation deals only with immovables. Two more open and flagrant illegalities were, we think, never committed by a civilised Government.

The whole story of the treatment of the Natus reflects a deep stain on English rule in India. Lord George Hamilton has not scrupled to defend their imprisonment by connecting them with the murders of Mr. Rand and Mr. Ayerst. The murderer has now been tried and executed, and Mr. Crowe, the judge who tried him, has declared that there was no evidence of any conspiracy. Yet Lord George Hamilton has never formally withdrawn this foul charge, nor apologised to the victims of it, who were never given the opportunity of proving their innocence in open court. He has preferred, when this the original charge has broken down, to bring forward other and lesser charges, each equally lacking in proof, and in regard to them also the opportunity for defence has been equally refused to the prisoners. If to this we add the violations of law on the part of the authorities referred to above, we get a scandalous picture of injustice, such as it would be hard to surpass in the annals of the worst and most despotic Governments.

THE CANT OF "NO PARTY."

THERE are, it would seem, certain formulas or catch-words which are always secure of the approval of the House of Commons. It is not so much that members have thought them out, and have come deliberately to the conclusion that they contain pearls of wisdom, as that they have by frequent repetition acquired a sort of respectability. They are old friends. They have a consoling effect upon the ear, without making any demand upon the brain. Let them be uttered by one of the great, wise, and eminent ornaments of the front benches, and the listless audience, roused to a pleasant sense of recognition, exclaims "hear, hear" with as little reflective meaning as an automatic machine. That the catchword should embody something which is true is by no means required. On the contrary, if it gives currency to what on examination is at once seen to be a transparent fallacy, the music, as Bacon says, will be the fuller. Of these bits of conventional claptrap, perhaps the most grateful and comforting to the House of Commons, and the most irritating to anybody who looks into the facts, is the proposition that questions connected with India are not and must not be treated as "party questions." It might be worth while, if time and space permitted, to consider the implied judgment which members of all parties, when they applaud this formula, pass upon their own habitual conduct. What, we might ask, are those essential ingredients in party questions and the ordinary treatment of them which make it improper and, as it were, impious to think of including Indian questions among such questions, and subjecting them to the same treatment? We forbear to enter into the alluring theme. But it is plainly suggested that party questions are apt to be subjected to considerations of a type from which Indian questions are rightly kept free—in particular, we suppose, that party questions are apt to be judged not exclusively upon the intrinsic merits of the case, but to some extent also by reference to party loyalties and the more or less continuous competition of the "ins" and the "outs." If this be so, it follows that when a man denies that Indian questions are party questions, he means that Indian questions *are* judged solely upon their merits, and are *not* confused, say, by the desire of the Ministerial majority to keep their leaders in office. If that were the case, nothing could be happier. It would indeed be well with the people of India if their petitions to the British House of Commons were considered always in a disinterested temper of justice and sound sense, undimmed by the mists of partisanship. But will any candid observer say that this is the case? Nay, will anybody acquainted with the institutions which, taken together, make up the British Constitution declare that, under our existing system, this can ever be the case? For, so far as Parliament is concerned, the official head of Indian administration is the Secretary of State for India. That he himself is a partisan, and has obtained his high place in return for services rendered or supposed to have been rendered to his party, is a fact of some though not of much importance. What is really important is that he is a member of the Government of the day, that a vote of censure upon him is a vote of censure upon the Government of which he is a member, and therefore that when his conduct of any matter is the subject of any motion expressing disapproval, the whole interest of the Ministerial party in the House lies in rejecting the motion and saving, not so much the reputation of the Secretary of State, as the existence of the Government. The share of the Secretary of State in moulding the policy of the Government of India is, of course, enormous. Either as an individual or in consultation with the Council of India he decides what course shall be adopted at all the most critical junctures of British policy in India. He may or (as Sir Henry Fowler's lamentable excursion into Waziristan showed) he may not secure the approval of his colleagues in the Cabinet before translating his decision into act. But in either case the House of Commons cannot censure his acts without destroying the Government. The members of the Cabinet are collectively responsible to Parliament. They stand or fall together.

It is plain, therefore, that from Parliamentary debates and still more from Parliamentary divisions relating to the most important Indian questions it is impossible, under our present system, to eliminate the disturbing element of party loyalty to the Government of the day. Tory members when a Tory Government is in office vote for the "forward" policy beyond the North-West frontier of India not because they approve it, but because they detest Home Rule for Ireland. They vote for the continued imprisonment of the Natu brothers without trial, not because they think acts of this kind are consonant with the traditions of British rule, but because they desire to back up the House of Lords. And we suppose that, before the end of the present Session, they will vote for the new law of sedition in India not because they like it but because they dislike taxation of ground values. The paramount question in their minds is not, Do we think the Secretary of State for India is right in this matter?—but, Do we want a dissolution, a general election, and the return of our political opponents to office? Accordingly the policy dictated by the Secretary of State secures a majority on a division, not at all because of its merits, but because of the antipathy of the Ministerialists to the Opposition. If transactions of this kind are not equivalent to treating Indian questions as party questions, then we should like to know what is. Sometimes a Secretary of State virtually admits the truth. For example, in the debate on Sir W. Wedderburn's amendment regretting the retention of Chitral (House of Commons, February 17, 1896), Lord George Hamilton used these never-to-be-forgotten words:—

> Before sitting down he congratulated his friends behind him that the first time they had to give a party vote last year they were actuated by true political instincts when, by an overwhelming majority, they assented to this forward movement. He believed there had been no forward movement in recent years made by any Government which had been more beneficial to all concerned, and which would more tend to put an end to those periodical disturbances and outbreaks of fanaticism and terrorism which had characterised that part of her Majesty's dominions.

"A party vote"—yes, and it was taken upon an amendment to the motion to go into Committee on the East India Revenue Accounts. It may well be that the "forward" policy beyond the Indian frontier is (or was, before the recent humiliating war) much more congenial to the present Ministerial majority in the House of Commons than some other acts of Lord George Hamilton's. But that does not diminish the truth of the general statement that whenever disapproval of a particular departure in British Indian policy is carried to the point at which it might begin to be effective—whenever, that is, it threatens a vote of censure upon the Secretary of State—the Ministerial majority respond to the Ministerial whip in order to save the Government from defeat. This is no accidental occurrence. It is part and parcel of the present system which makes the responsible head of Indian administration a member of the British Cabinet. The evil would, no doubt, be removed or greatly diminished if the Parliamentary head of the India Office were selected from the private members below the gangway—if, for example, he were such a man as Mr. Leonard Courtney, whose character and attainments secure for him, although he is not a member of the Cabinet, a personal influence in Parliament hardly second to that of any Minister. But of course any such arrangement as this would involve a revolution in our present theory of Parliamentary control. A private member is responsible only to his constituents. It is through being a Minister, and thereby involving the fortunes of a Government, that the Secretary of State for India becomes responsible to Parliament. We are not suggesting anything so far-reaching as a change in this system. But let us clear our minds of cant and recognise that, so long as the system lasts, it is nonsensical claptrap to say that Indian questions are not party questions.

Is it suggested, then, that when Secretaries of State declare that Indian questions are not party questions and must not be treated as such, they mean simply nothing at all? We do not think so. On the contrary, they really mean a good deal. They mean that they hope the Opposition will not oppose. That this is necessarily what they mean is, it seems to us, proved by the circumstances of the case. A Secretary of State whose policy is impugned knows perfectly well that, if the matter is taken to a division, he can count with confidence upon the most effective of all levers—the fear of the Government's defeat—to compel the support of a sufficient number of Ministerialists. The scope that remains for party warfare is limited to the Opposition, and the only question is whether they will bring their heavy artillery to bear in the debate and in the division. Professing to utter a bald

statement of fact, the Secretary of State is in effect making an appeal to his opponents, being perfectly assured that his statement will be contradicted in act by his political friends. He counts upon *their* acting as partisans, and appeals to the Opposition to act as patriots, meaning thereby that they should surrender their right of private judgment and allow the India Office and the Government of India to proceed upon their way without let or hindrance. Plain men do not call this a policy of patriotism. They call it a policy of shirk. And that, we fear, is what Secretaries and ex-Secretaries of State for India ardently desire. For ex-Secretaries no less than Secretaries repeat the parrot-cry, being both alike under the domination of the permanent officials; and while one of them is, in the name of prudent statesmanship, pursuing the line of least resistance, his predecessor is conscious that in similar circumstances he did the same thing himself, and, if the circumstances are repeated, will do the same thing again. And while these amiable gentlemen are engaged in what they call a policy of wise administration, but what unprejudiced observers call the art of making things comfortable for themselves now and hereafter, the only part of the House of Commons from which an unbiassed judgment could be obtained is solemnly exhorted, in the name of unbiassed judgment, to abstain from exercising judgment at all. Now, nobody would be more sorry than we should to see India converted into a football for political parties at home. But we see not the least prospect of that danger. On the contrary, what we do see is ultra-Tory bureaucracy enthroned in despotic power, while those who profess Liberal principles remain supine or even acquiescent. We do not ask the Liberal party to convert Indian questions into "party questions." But we ask them what their principles are worth, and what will ultimately become of them at home, if they contentedly overlook the negation of them in India. Mr. John Morley ("On Compromise," p. 124) has indicated concisely enough the sort of principles we mean:—

> Liberalism (he writes) would be something more generous, more attractive—yes, and more practically effective—if its professors and champions could allow their sense of what is feasible to be refreshed and widened by a more free recognition, however private and undemonstrative, of the theoretic ideas which give their social creed whatever life and consistency it may have. Such ideas are these: That the conditions of the social union are not a mystery, only to be touched by miracle, but the results of explicable causes, and susceptible of constant modification: that the thoughts of wise and patriotic men should be perpetually turned towards the improvement of these conditions in every direction: that contented acquiescence in the ordering that has come down to us from the past is selfish and anti-social, because amid the ceaseless change that is inevitable in a growing organism, the institutions of the past demand progressive re-adaptations: that such improvements are most likely to be secured in the greatest abundance by limiting the sphere of authority, extending that of free individuality, and steadily striving after the bestowal, so far as the nature of things will ever permit it, of equality of opportunity: that while there is dignity in ancestry, a modern society is only safe in proportion as it summons capacity to its public counsels and enterprises: that such a society to endure must progress: that progress on its political side means more than anything else the substitution of Justice as a governing idea instead of Privilege, and that the best guarantee for justice in public dealings is the participation in their own government of the people most likely to suffer from injustice.

Have ideas like these no application to the government of India?

SIR RICHARD MEADE:[1]
AN UNFORTUNATE BIOGRAPHY.

By Professor A. F. Murison, LL.D.

> "It is thus apparent that, from first to last, a retrospect of our relations with the Nizam should be carefully avoided by resolute sticklers for the perfection of British rule. Few chapters of its history, it is to be hoped, are so calculated to tax either the credulity of devotees or the versatile audacity of hirelings."—Colonel Hastings Fraser, "Claims of the Nizam," ch. xi.

Sir Richard Meade was one of the most distinguished and most faithful servants of the Government of India in his time. He was an Irishman, born at Innishannon in 1821. He went out to India as a cadet in the East India Company's service in 1838; took part in the Burmese campaign in 1853-54; and performed marked service in the Indian Mutiny, when he raised a regiment of cavalry, "Meade's Horse" (afterwards merged in the "Central India Horse"), with which he was engaged about Gwalior in June, 1858, and captured the rebel leader, Tantia Topi. Dr. Thornton lauds "his brilliant success and dash in circumventing and capturing Tantia Topi," but the essence of the transaction was the getting of Mán Singh to betray his friend and guest into Meade's hands. Meade's personal gallantry was conspicuously manifested by his entering Gwalior Palace and inducing the rebels to surrender without more bloodshed—a service overlooked in the despatches. There is no question that he was a most capable military officer. His military career, however, terminated with the Mutiny. After twenty years' service, he was only Major.

In 1859, Meade was transferred to the political department. He succeeded Major Macpherson as Political Agent at Gwalior. Dr. Thornton very rightly enquires into the secret of his success in his new career. He finds it to have been this: that Meade added to his long experience of Indian character and his fair linguistic attainments "all the characteristics of the ideal 'English gentleman'—firmness and loyalty to the Government he served, deep interest in the chiefs and peoples of the States where he was employed, good sense, straightforwardness, unbounded patience, a most genial manner, and a scrupulous regard for the feelings and position of the Prince to whom he was accredited." The strange thing is that Dr. Thornton should apparently regard these qualifications as matter of distinctive praise; we should have assumed them as the very minimum of such an officer's outfit, and taken them for granted. In 1861 Meade was sent to Indore as Resident and Agent for Central India, where he quietly accomplished a great deal of useful work during eight years. In 1869 he was made Chief Commissioner of Mysore and Coorg, an express recognition by Lord Mayo of his performance at Indore. In 1873 he was appointed president of a commission to enquire into the tangled affairs of Baroda; and in connexion with this, Dr. Thornton gives considerable space to the trial and deposition of the Gaekwar, Malhar Rao. Meade got his K.C.S.I., and reorganised the Baroda Government. In 1875 he obtained the blue ribbon of the service, the post of Resident at Hyderabad in the Deccan. He retired in 1881. Lord Lytton had recommended him for G.C.S.I., but on a change of Government the recommendation fell through. Meade's record, however, is sufficiently distinguished to satisfy any reasonable ambition.

We expressly limit our attention to points in the case of Hyderabad; for, to discuss even that case with anything like fulness and clearness would require several whole issues of India. Dr. Thornton's narrative is trustfully official. His defence of the Government of India and of Meade ought, in justice to both, to have included a fair and square examination of the facts, which it does not. His presentation of the treaty of 1853 and the assignment of Berar, the attitude of Sir Salar Jung, the question of the co-Regency, and the criticisms of the *Statesman* — we cannot characterise these crucial sections otherwise than as lamentable caricatures of history, discrediting his work. Dr. Thornton himself was Officiating Secretary to the Government of India when Meade was at Hyderabad, and he must be taken to have been and to be familiar with every one of these episodes. But that even an official should write as he does seems, at this time of day, the very acme of fatuity.

Take the Treaty of 1853. Dr. Thornton says the Nizam "was naturally distressed at the assignment of Berar," and adds in a note "though he deliberately accepted the arrangement in preference to the disbandment of the Contingent which was offered as an alternative." Yes, "deliberately accepted"; just as a man might make his choice between putting his neck in the noose and laying it on the block. He says the Nizam, when he signed the treaty, was in "unusually good spirits." That is a matter of interpretation; but if it be meant to convey that the Nizam was ever content with the arrangement, it is wholly and glaringly against the facts, for Colonel Davidson, whose testimony is indisputable, tells us frankly that the Nizam submitted only to Lord Dalhousie's "objurgations and threats"—the threat of military coercion, which would have certainly been followed by dethronement. Dr. Thornton states the alternative as "the disbandment of the

[1] "General Sir Richard Meade, and the Feudatory States of Central and Southern India: A Record of Forty-three Years' Service as Soldier, Political Officer, and Administrator." By Thomas Henry Thornton, C.S.I., D.C.L., sometime Foreign Secretary to the Government of India. With portrait, map, and illustrations. (London, New York, and Bombay: Longmans, Green and Co.)

Contingent." He does not add that the alternative was a mere mockery, or that it was accompanied with an infamous threat. He ignores the fact that the Resident intimated to the Nizam that, if the Contingent were disbanded, the British Subsidiary Force would stand aside and refuse to put down any disturbances that might arise —although the Subsidiary Force was charged with the maintenance of tranquillity in the Nizam's territories under the treaty of 1800, and although the Contingent had been oppressively established to relieve the Subsidiary Force, and both bodies had been set up in deliberate defiance of justice and honour, at the expense of the Nizam's pocket and political independence. Dr. Thornton says this treaty, "like many good things Indian, has been the object of fierce attack." It has; but does he mean to say that this treaty was itself a "good thing"? He does, and on these grounds:—

It has secured for Hyderabad several inestimable benefits: it removed what was once a perpetual cause of friction between the British Government and the Nizam; reduced the extravagant cost of the Contingent; provided for the internal tranquillity of the Nizam's dominions; and, lastly, laid the foundations of the present splendid prosperity of the Assigned Districts.

The bland assurance of this statement is simply amazing. What was the "perpetual cause of friction"? The insistence of the Government in demanding payments to which they were not entitled. "The extravagant cost of the Contingent"? Yes, a cost absolutely monstrous, unparalleled in the history even of military extravagance, and acknowledged explicitly by Lord Dalhousie himself, who might at any moment with a stroke of his pen have reduced it, but did not reduce it till the burden on the Nizam had served as the ground for the compulsory assignment of Berar—a Contingent kept up solely for British benefit, and in no way under the Nizam's control. "The internal tranquillity of the Nizam's dominions": what on earth was disturbing or threatening the tranquillity of the Nizam's dominions? It was a time of profound peace. And as for the prosperity of Berar, who can suppose that Sir Salar Jung would not have administered a fine country like Berar so as to produce "the present splendid prosperity"? He unquestionably produced equal prosperity in the Hyderabad districts left to the Nizam. Such a tissue of bad history and misleading nonsense has seldom appeared in black and white under a reputable name. And, even supposing all these results were absolutely acknowledged, are we to justify evil by good results? The treaty was forced on the Nizam by way of exaction of a balance of account. What was this account? In 1860, Colonel Davidson, then Resident, went over the question with full knowledge and care, and officially reported to the Government of India itself this conclusion: "I believe it must be apparent, from what I have stated above, that in 1853 we had little or no real pecuniary claim against the Nizam." Does Dr. Thornton know better than Colonel Davidson? If so, why not deal with Colonel Davidson's official figures? The whole affair was disgraceful to the last degree. Colonel Hastings Fraser has examined it thoroughly, with ample reference to the documents, and reached this distressing, yet irrefragable, conclusion:—

It appears to me, therefore, impossible to avoid the conclusion that in 1851, when the Nizam was compelled to pay upwards of forty-two lakhs of rupees by Lord Dalhousie's peremptory demand for territorial security, and in 1853, when, under threats of military coercion, he was made to give territorial security for an alleged debt of about forty-three lakhs more, his Highness did not owe one single rupee to the Honourable Company, but that, on the contrary, the pecuniary balance, if rightly calculated, would have been immensely in favour of the Hyderabad State.

So much for this "good thing Indian," the Treaty of 1853. Next, as to the attitude of Sir Salar Jung. True, Dr. Thornton speaks highly of Sir Salar: how could any writer do otherwise? But he says:—

But in matters of *la haute politique*—affecting the relations between the British Government and the Nizam—Sir Salar Jung was a dreamer, not a statesman; deserving—not, indeed, harsh judgment—but a place with Rienzi, in the category of those "qui ont pris les souvenirs pour les espérances."

This detraction means simply that Sir Salar Jung acted manfully in his office for the restitution of his master's property and dignity. Sir Salar did his best for the Nizam; he was a dreamer. Sir Richard Meade did his best for the Government of India; he was the *beau idéal* of statesmanship and diplomacy. Sir Salar Jung knew the gross injustice that his master had suffered; he believed in the eventual recognition of right by the British suzerain and people; he persistently urged his case. If he turned out to be "a dreamer," what is to be said of British honour and justice? But the glory of Sir Salar Jung is not at the mercy of Dr. Thornton.

Let us turn to the question of the co-Regency. In April, 1877, Sir Salar's colleague, the Amír-i-Kabír died. Sir Salar justly believed he could work better without a hampering colleague, and said so; but "this was an assumption of supreme power in Hyderabad which could not, of course, be acquiesced in." Who then should be nominated?

The person admitted even by Sir Salar Jung himself to be best fitted for the post—by position and intelligence—was the Amír-i-Kabír's brother, the Nawáb Vikar-ul-Umra. He was not only first of all the nobles of Hyderabad, but. . . . . Practically the only reason against his appointment was the fact that he was a *persona ingratissima* to Sir Salar Jung. . . . . It was clear also that the Nawáb had the strongest possible claims to the vacant post of co-administrator, and there was no one else to take his place.

Do we wake, or do we dream? "No one else to take his place"! Where was Bushír-ud-Daulah, who had been nominated by the deceased Amír-i-Kabír to succeed him—a man of unsullied character, a known loyalist (to the British Government as well as to the Nizam), a man that would certainly have co-operated harmoniously with Sir Salar Jung, that had positively been trained in view of his appointment, and that had actually received the thanks of the Government of India for his performance of the duties of co-Regent and Minister during Sir Salar's absence in England? But, then, he was Sir Salar's own son-in-law and nephew. Now, what of Vikar-ul-Umra? What of his "strongest possible claims"?

Has Dr. Thornton studied the Administration Report of the Resident, Mr. Saunders, for 1869-70? He would read there that Mr. Saunders then informed his Government that the constant thwarting of Sir Salar Jung's policy by intrigues made his (Sir Salar's) office "doubly difficult to fill," and "his burden a doubly heavy one to bear"; so much so, that, to the Resident's knowledge, Sir Salar "felt at times inclined to withdraw from the struggle altogether." Who was the arch-intriguer? Mr. Saunders states that "it was not thought just to the Minister (Sir Salar), or safe to the stability of his administration, that anything approaching to freedom of intercourse should take place between the Resident and the other nobles"; and that "one of the latter, having been pronounced guilty, some eight years ago, of lending himself to an intrigue, the object of which it was believed was to procure for himself the office of Minister, had been prohibited, under the order of the supreme Government, from appearing on any public occasion, the Nizam's own durbars not excepted, where the British representative was present." We do not desire to set forth particulars of the scandalous "intrigue." But will the uninitiated reader believe that this miserable intriguer was Vikar-ul-Umra—the only eligible co-Regent for Sir Salar Jung, "the person admitted even by Sir Salar Jung himself to be the best fitted for the post by position and intelligence"? The simple fact is, that Lord Lytton had made up his mind that Sir Salar must be checkmated at all costs.

Dr. Thornton refers particularly to the persistent efforts of the *Statesman* "to vilify and discredit the Nawáb with the view of bringing about, if possible, his dismissal from the office of co-Regent." How could an honest journalist manage "to vilify and discredit" a false, disloyal knave like this Nawab? Dr. Thornton tells us of various legal proceedings taken against Mr. Knight, the proprietor of the *Statesman*. He has also the grace to tell us that they all fell through. Mr. Knight openly challenged investigation. Well he might, with such a case in hand. It will not do for Dr. Thornton to cast imputations on Mr. Knight; and Lord Lytton's strong language will not serve him. We know Lord Lytton. We also knew, intimately, both Mr. Knight and his London editor, Colonel R. D. Osborn; and that at the time when the stinging articles were published. We take leave to say, solemnly and emphatically, that no more honourable, more sincere, or more patriotic men ever breathed. But, after all, in any case, the publicist has to do with the facts; and, whatever the spirit of the critic, it is for the historian to face the critic's facts and arguments. Dr. Thornton's effort

can only be regarded as an egregious evasion. It is also a melancholy disservice to the memory of Sir Richard Meade, who was really a distinguished man, and whose fault at Hyderabad was simply this: that, after having exposed the whole situation to Lord Lytton, he allowed himself to be degraded from an agent to an instrument—the instrument of grievous wrong deliberately perpetrated.

THE DELHI MUTINY.[1]

THIS latest contribution to the ever accumulating mass of literature about the Sepoy Mutiny of 1857 consists of two Native narratives of the siege of Delhi, translated by the late Mr. Charles Theophilus Metcalfe, of the Bengal Civil Service. The first narrative is from the pen of Mainodin Hassan Khan, who held an Inspectorship of Police at Delhi in 1857. On the outbreak of the Mutiny, Mainodin, with a view to his own safety, joined the king's party. "If I had remained a passive spectator of this rebellion," he writes, "my life would certainly have been taken, while if I had left the city and joined the English, the honour of my family would have been destroyed, and the rebels would have wreaked their vengeance upon them, for I was not an obscure man. I knew the position of the English, and how it would be before the English Government could again reassert its authority and sovereignty; so in my inmost heart I thought I was doing the best I could during the interval." Mainodin got himself appointed colonel of a regiment of mutineers, but, according to his own account, he chiefly used this position to assist in the escape of Sir John Metcalfe and to procure his own safety from attack. Having no sympathy with bloodshed and lawlessness, he prudently "placed himself on the sick list, and remained at home, at the same time confining his military duties to attendance on the king." But, of course, he had compromised himself by taking service under the king; and, when the British army entered Delhi in September, he fled, with a price upon his head, to Bombay, and thence to Arabia. Subsequently he surrendered, under advice, to the authorities at Delhi. He was tried, acquitted of complicity in the murder of Europeans, and pardoned for his share in the rebellion. More than that, a donation was granted to his family by the Government of India in consideration of his service in saving the life of Sir John Metcalfe. Mainodin wrote his account of the siege at the request of Mr. C. T. Metcalfe, but stipulated that it should not be published till after his death.

The second and more detailed narrative is the diary kept during the siege by Munshi Jiwan Lal, who for many years lived in close contact with the king of Delhi and his court, acting as accountant of the pensions paid by the British Government to the king's family. "No more trustworthy or loyal Native servant has the British Government ever had." He was resident in Delhi during the siege, and was often in fear of his life, but was protected by palace influence. He gave his diary to Mr. Metcalfe at the Imperial Assemblage held at Delhi in 1877. Jiwan Lal's story, being a strictly contemporary record made for his own use, is of much greater interest and value than Mainodin's account, which was written long after the events and by a man of timorous nature, who evidently had difficulty in persuading himself that he had really been pardoned for his own defection. The tragi-comedy of the court of Delhi—the mock grandeur of the king, his utter powerlessness, the insolence of his officers, the solace he found in the composition of bad verses, the various shifts for raising money, the scene when the king offered his jewellery to his officers, "Take this and forget your hunger"—all this is vividly reproduced in Jiwan Lal's diary. Still it must be remembered that his position in Delhi was not a very prominent one, and that much of what he sets down must be merely the gossip of the bazaars. Upon the whole, it cannot be said that his story adds materially to our knowledge of what passed in Delhi during the siege. Still less is it true to say that it throws new light upon the causes of the Sepoy Mutiny. Its sole significance lies in the fact that it is a contribution from the Native side.

[1] "Two Native Narratives of the Mutiny in Delhi." Translated from the Originals by the late C. T. Metcalfe, C.S.I. Westminster: A. Constable and Co.

OUR LONDON LETTER.

(FROM A PARLIAMENTARY CORRESPONDENT.)

I WROTE last week, I believe, somewhat fully about the House of Lords, and this week also the doings of that House deserve a passing reference. This is because on Friday last, when they were discussing the Benefices Bill, what Rider Haggard would call a strange thing happened. A peer, Earl Grey, actually wanted to introduce into the Bill some amount of recognition of the parishioner in the matter of the appointment of a clergyman. I do not mean to enter into the matter at length, as I recognise that the methods of the Church of England can scarcely be interesting to many outside it. But Earl Grey's proposal led to a rather amusing result. All he suggested was this—a bishop should refuse to institute a clergyman when the bishop thought that the objections of the churchwardens acting for the parishioners were well founded. That seems mild enough, but it roused Lord Salisbury to say things against churchwardens! That is a new departure in English politics. The Prime Minister declared that to assent to Earl Grey's amendment would be to elevate the churchwarden into a temporary Pope. It is not clear how this would come about, for the bishop was only to act when he thought the churchwarden's reasons well-founded. If anyone is a temporary Pope it is the bishop. Nor was Lord Salisbury's onslaught on churchwardens the only thing calculated to make men rub their eyes, for in the debate the Archbishop of Canterbury took one view and the Archbishop of York another, and in the division they actually went into different lobbies! I have written about all sorts of little splits in the Unionist party, and of rifts in the Ministerial lute, but I confess I did not expect to live to see an Archiepiscopal split. It makes one think of the time when there were two Popes issuing bulls and curses against each other to the confusion of the faithful. My sympathies go with the Archbishop of York, but when most reverend prelates disagree I stand discreetly aside and do not venture to intervene.

In the Commons there are already signs, unmistakable signs, of the end of the Session. I think I have already explained more than once that the Session has been dull beyond all precedent, and I did not think anyone would be able to induce the House to indulge in an all-night sitting about anything. Yet it came to pass that last Thursday the House sat through the night until 5 o'clock on the Friday morning. It is customary to connect an all-night sitting with scenes, and with excursions and alarums. And when the House is detained all night in discussing an Irish Bill it seems almost impossible that there should not be wigs on the green and the fur flying. Yet this abnormal Session sustained its character even in this respect, for this long, long sitting was uneventful from beginning to end. And I may say that of all dull experiences, a dull all-night sitting is the most dreary. It seems so purposeless, and when the morning sun shone into the House, and the birds could be heard twittering outside, it seemed incredible that the members should be unable or unwilling to get up a single scene. Nay, more than that, Mr. Tim Healy pronounced a touching benediction upon the Chief Secretary.

And now until the end of the Session the salutary 12 o'clock rule has been suspended. All leaders of the House try to force the pace in this way, and the private members, or some of them, always protest. I believe we owe this wise 12 o'clock rule to the late Mr. W. H. Smith more than to anyone else, and only those who sat in the House before its operation can appreciate its wisdom. Mr. Balfour, in moving its suspension, made the promise always made on such occasions—that of course there was no intention of keeping the House to unreasonable hours. It is a promise easily made—and even more easily broken. And yet the easily gulled members always cheer it. I remember Mr. Balfour saying just the same thing last year, and yet the House was kept scandalously late on fifteen different nights, and to make the matter worse, Mr. Balfour strolled away about midnight on each occasion and let the humbler members toil and moil in his absence. There is not the slightest need this year for any such exceptional sittings as there is no important business before the House. It is rather hard to expect the House to sit late in order to attend to a lot of trivialities. It is

amusing to notice that not only is the Government unable to say anything about its intentions with regard to Old Age Pensions—the subject of fine promises at the last General Election—but it has also quietly dropped the London Municipalities Bill. This Bill was put in the very forefront of the Queen's Speech and was heralded by a great, and also a miraculously foolish speech by Lord Salisbury. Now it is relegated to "an early period next Session," that convenient limbo from whose bourne few legislative measures ever return.

I have written repeatedly about the dulness of Parliament, and it is only fair therefore that I should acknowledge that there were a few hours of interest on Tuesday, leading up to a sensational *denouement*. The business before the House was the Vaccination Bill as amended in the Grand Committee, and the Bill was in charge of Mr. Chaplin. I am not going into the merits of vaccination or non-vaccination here, but what is of real interest, apart from the merits of that case, is the triumph which public opinion has, rightly or wrongly, gained. It has become more and more apparent that in the country a strong feeling against compulsory vaccination has been growing up. Let us suppose that the man who refuses to have his child vaccinated is a mischievous fool. That is a very different matter from his being a criminal, and yet he has been treated as a criminal. Some magistrates appear to have taken a special delight in insulting and harrying men who conscientiously object to have this medical experiment tried on their children. The result has been martyrs—and conscientious martyrs have always been too much for the law.

I knew of the growth of this opinion in the country, but I must confess I had no idea that it had inoculated Parliament to such an extent. Yet on Tuesday it was made abundantly evident that members had been frightened by outside pressure. Member after member, especially on the Tory side, rose, and in a half shamefaced way which told that the screw had been applied pleaded for the conscientious objector. Mr. Chaplin was, as usual, deliciously absurd. Here is a specimen of his "argument." He said that vaccination was opposed by a small minority. If it was made voluntary the vast number of those now unvaccinated would be enormously increased, and then the public would censure the Government. That is really worth a moment's study as a specimen of Chaplinese "thought." First there are few who object; next the "vast number" which he a moment before called "a few" would be enormously increased (though public sentiment was in favour of vaccination), unless the people are compelled to vaccinate their children. And then as a final climax the public would censure the Government for not having forced them to do that which they wish to do!

But the really important part of the business came at the end. Mr. Balfour rose at a little before eleven. As early as eight I had heard that there was to be a climb down—and so there was, with a vengeance. Mr. Balfour made an ingenious speech, of course, but it all came to this, that in future a man has only to attend at a police-court and prove to the satisfaction of the court that he is a conscientious objector and he cannot be punished. This proposal is to operate for five years, to see how it works—but there is not likely to be any going back after five years are over. Mr. Balfour said that it would never do to shock public opinion. He means that it will never do for his party to lose bye-elections. While he spoke a contested election was going on at Reading. Both candidates have been forced to go against compulsory vaccination. That is the sort of thing which tells in the House of Commons. It is not principle so much as expediency—or translated into bald and vulgar prose, it is votes which influence members. I could not help thinking, as I watched this interesting development, how differently public opinion in India is treated. The publications issued by the anti-vaccinists in this country would, if issued in India, land the writers in prison. They make no secret of the fact that they are not well affected towards the Government. Yet it was failing to show an active affection for the Government which landed Mr. Tilak in prison. Many Natives, educated gentlemen, have had to submit to methods even more objectionable to them than vaccination is to the anti-vaccinists in connexion with the treatment of the plague. But their objections, so far from getting them consideration, have brought punishment. Surely I need not point out how it is that the House is so ready to recognise the justice of the English "agitation" and yet to ignore that in India. It is because the English "agitators" have votes and the Indian "agitators" have not.

CHRONICLE OF THE WEEK.

Thursday, July 14.—General Shafter this afternoon telegraphed to Washington that General Toral had agreed to surrender Santiago on the condition of the troops being returned to Spain. The agreement embraced the surrender of the whole of Eastern Cuba with its garrisons, numbering thirty thousand men. The American War Department telegraphed approval of General Shafter's action, so far as it was known, but asked for further details of the surrender. Before the Spanish troops were conveyed to Spain in American vessels, the Madrid Government would, it was stated, be required to guarantee the safety of the transport ships. General Miles to-day assumed the command of the United States forces investing Santiago.

Mr. George Doughty, M.P. for Grimsby, who had hitherto been reckoned as a Home Ruler, sent a letter to his constituents defending his vote on the Government side in the Financial Relations debate. Ireland, he alleged, had been most generously treated by the Exchequer, and the manufacture of this latest grievance had convinced him that Irish demands would never be satisfied short of separation. He was strongly opposed to Home Rule, and he thought it better to assist in bringing about useful reforms than to endeavour to put the Radical party in power with the aid of the hopelessly disorganised Irish factions. The occasion of Mr. Doughty's conversion to Unionism was a little peculiar, as the Act of Union expressly provided that Ireland was entitled to be treated as a separate financial entity—the whole point of "this latest grievance."

Friday, July 15.—The Constitutional guarantees were suspended in Spain and military law, as far as public meetings and publications were concerned, was proclaimed in the capital. It was said that not much inconvenience was likely to be caused to well-disposed citizens by the former precaution. The fall of Santiago (where the final details of surrender were still being arranged) had caused disappointment but no surprise in Madrid. Commodore Watson's squadron, which was to sail for Spain, was being very considerably strengthened.

It was announced that an Imperial Parcel Post was considered at the recent conference, in addition to the proposal with regard to the reduction of the letter rate, and a scheme drawn up by the Postmaster-General was to be laid immediately before the colonial Governments. The suggestion was to charge 1s. for parcels up to 3 lb. exchanged between the United Kingdom and any other part of the Empire; 2s. between 3 lb. and 7 lb.; and 3s. between 7 lb. and 11 lb.

Lord Reay, Chairman of the London School Board, opened in Clerkenwell an exhibition of designs, wood-carvings, and other work done by Board School children. He called the attention of employers of labour to the skill shown by many of the exhibitors, and pointed out the national importance of this kind of artistic training.

Saturday, July 16.—The South Wales Coal Strike was no nearer to a settlement as the result of to-day's conference, except that the masters had now drawn up a statement announcing directly to the men the terms upon which they were willing to resume work. At the conference the miners' representatives demanded that an umpire should be appointed before the discussion began. As the employers had declined to admit any intervention, this brought the meeting to an end at once.

Serious rioting in Shanghai was caused by a dispute between the local French authorities and the natives concerning a burial ground of which the former compelled the sale. A party was landed from a French cruiser and the mob of rioters was fired on, a number of natives being killed and wounded.—Chinamen in favour of reforms on Western lines were stated to be reinforcing the ranks of the rebels in the south; and there was a report of another insurrection in the North-West of China.

The provisional settlement in Crete appeared to give little satisfaction to any one, and the withdrawal of the Turkish troops was still anxiously looked for by the islanders.

Sunday, July 17.—At nine o'clock this morning General Toral, the commander of Santiago, surrendered the town and all the stores. The troops deposited their arms in the armoury over which an American guard was placed. At noon the Stars and Stripes were hoisted over the house of civil government. An immense crowd of people were present, and a salute of twenty-one guns was fired. The terms of the capitulation were not settled till late on Friday.

It was said that General Shafter had agreed that the Spanish troops should be accorded the honours of war, but the Government overruled this, and insisted that they should leave as prisoners of war. This unconciliatory attitude was regarded in Madrid as boding ill for the prospects of an early peace. It was still uncertain whether their arms will be returned to the

Spanish troops or not. The Americans were now minded to push on both the expeditions against Puerto Rico and that which was to sail for the coast of Spain.

MONDAY, July 18.—President M'Kinley stated that he had received no communication bearing on peace from Spain directly or indirectly. Vigorous measures were therefore being taken to prosecute the war. Orders were given for Commodore Watson's squadron to sail for the Spanish coast at the end of this week. The expedition of twenty-five thousand men, under General Miles, was to be ready to leave for Puerto Rico in a fortnight. From Madrid it was reported that much anxiety prevailed lest the United States should push on with their operations against Puerto Rico and Manila, and even make a descent upon Spain, before peace overtures were accepted; and there was consequently a strong desire for early and direct negotiations with President M'Kinley. Appalling scenes arising from distress were witnessed in Santiago; but it was stated in New York that great relief would soon be afforded by the reopening of the mines in the neighbourhood, and by the resumption of trade which the United States Government had authorised. From Manila it was reported that General Aguinaldo had sent to the Captain General, urging him to agree to an honourable surrender; but the Spanish commander replied that he must fight to the end.

It was announced that Mr. George Doughty, M.P., would address his constituents at Grimsby on Wednesday evening to explain further the views put forth in his letter of last week. Before this meeting was announced to-day the Grimsby Radical Club had telegraphed to Sir William Harcourt to say that they entirely disagreed with Mr. Doughty's views as to the futility of working for Home Rule, and that they must take some action in the matter.

M. Zola and M. Perreux, of the *Aurore* newspaper, were sentenced by the Assize Court at Versailles to undergo a year's imprisonment and pay fines of 3,000f. for the libel on the First Council of War contained in M. Zola's articles on the Dreyfus case. After a wrangle between counsel and judges, the defendants withdrew and allowed judgment to go by default. It was said that they would appeal to the Court of Cassation.

The West Down Vacancy, caused by the resignation of Lord Arthur Hill, was filled by the unopposed return of Captain Hill, the retiring member's son.

TUESDAY, July 19.—President M'Kinley issued an important State paper—a document marking a new departure in the history of the United States—in which he laid down the principles on which the territory surrendered in Cuba was to be administered for the time being. The commerce of all neutral nations was to be allowed entry, and the inhabitants were to be treated with all possible consideration. The attitude of the Germans at Manila still seemed to be causing Admiral Dewey some trouble.

The Porte declined to make any compensation for the losses suffered by British and French subjects during the massacres in Constantinople.

WEDNESDAY, July 20.—Mr. Doughty, M.P., informed his constituents at Grimsby that he had applied for the Chiltern Hundreds, having sufficient confidence in his position to go to the arbitrament of the poll. No candidate in opposition to Mr. Doughty had yet been secured by either party.

The Madrid Cabinet was said to be showing the greatest anxiety to avoid responsibility for the surrender of Santiago, and it was announced that General Toral would be tried by Court-martial for exceeding his powers.—In the United States the Cubans appeared to be regarded with less interest and less sympathy than when the war began. Some papers were even abusing them for doing nothing but consume American rations. It was reported from Santiago, too, that the sentiment of the United States troops was less favourable to Cubans than to the Spanish soldiers.

It was announced that the Gladstone Memorial Committee would propose at the Grosvenor-house meeting to-morrow, that in addition to the erection of monuments in London, Edinburgh, and Dublin (upon which they settled a fortnight ago), an offer should be made to the trustees of St. Deiniol's Library at Hawarden of a building to contain the books which Mr. Gladstone himself collected and arranged.

The Speaker was entertained at dinner by the Lord Mayor. Mr. Gully spoke of the antiquity of his office and the still greater antiquity of the Lord Mayor's, and touched upon some of the historical scenes in which the holders of these dignities had appeared together. Lord Peel combated the idea that the House of Commons was a degenerate Assembly, and expressed his confidence that it would continue to give the nation orators and statesmen to fill the places of those who passed away.

The Government of India are likely, the *Pioneer* understands, to address a further despatch to the Secretary of State regarding the North-West frontier, which is being taken up section by section. The Kohat-Kurram line and the Tochi section have yet to be dealt with. The Government of India, it understands, have dealt with the question of the Malakhand as well as of the Khyber in recent despatches to the Secretary of State.

EXPANSION BEYOND THE NORTH-WEST FRONTIER.

MR. THORBURN'S SPEECH AT SIMLA.

We referred in our issue of July 1 to the brief telegraphic report of the speech delivered by Mr. Thorburn, Financial Commissioner of the Punjab, at Simla on June 28 on the occasion of a lecture by Colonel Hutchinson, Director of Military Instruction, upon "The Story of Tirah and the Lessons of the Campaign." The journals to hand by the last mail from India now enable us to give a fuller account of Mr. Thorburn's important speech.

Colonel H. D. Hutchinson, it appears, acted as *Times* correspondent during the expedition against the Afridis and Orakzais. The lecture was delivered at the United Service Institution, Simla, the title being "The Story of Tirah and Lessons of the Campaign." Major-General Sir Edwin Collen, Military Member of Council, presided, and the ball-room of the Town Hall was densely packed. Among those present were His Excellency the Viceroy, the Lieutenant-Governor of the Punjab, the Commander-in-Chief, Sir James Westland, Sir A. C. Trevor, Mr. Chalmers, Mr. Rivaz, the Adjutant-General, the Quartermaster-General, and nearly every civil and military officer now in Simla. General Symons, just returned from the Khyber, arrived in time to hear the discussion.

The feature of the evening (says the *Times of India*) was a speech by Mr. Thorburn, now Financial Commissioner of the Punjab, which created a sensation. He said: Like others I have for years followed with a sort of foreboding interest the progressive development in the policy of expansion along our North-West frontier, which culminated in the conflagrations of last hot weather, when the fragile, costly, and inflammable jerry buildings we had erected caught fire and were nearly burnt down. In extinguishing the flames, the fire brigade lost 2,000 lives, and the bill to be paid by pauper India was about two and a-half millions sterling. Life is cheap, except for those who love, but money is always dear, especially good money, in India. I think many here will agree with me that in the lecture just heard there was a pronounced note of reserve; indeed, the lecture was as remarkable for facts and criticisms withheld as imparted. Colonel Hutchinson has only told us a few of the many lessons of Tirah. For instance, he has said nothing of the policy, strategy, or organisation; nothing of the long starvation of civil administrations owing to the constant outpouring of treasure on never-ending frontier wars; nothing of the wholesale impressment of men and animals in the Punjab which each war forces on Government. Impressment as practised in the Punjab, without discrimination, system, or organisation entails on the unfortunate population tenfold more suffering than is necessary. The Deputy Commissioner in the Punjab last year impressed 100,000 animals and 25,000 owners, but not more than 20 per cent. of these went to the front. But such subjects as these are outside the scope of discussion. (Loud applause.) Colonel Hutchinson has sketched with a light and almost uncertain brush what he supposes were the causes of the recent risings. He says that the execution of the Durand agreement in 1893 created a conviction in the minds of the tribesmen that we intended to destroy their independence. Upon this, the Pathans, he says, based their revolt. I quarrel with the word "revolt" as a misnomer. A revolt presupposes conquest and subjection. The frontier has never been conquered, and the tribesmen are almost as free now as in the days of Alexander, over 2,000 years ago. A more correct term would have been a struggle for freedom. After arguing that much the same fighting would have occurred between England and Scotland if a similar policy had been pursued in Great Britain, Mr. Thorburn continued: The expansion policy, as pushed since 1893, is responsible for all our troubles, and the feeling expressed by a Punjabi gentleman of light, leading, and observation during the recent risings was that the storm was due to the *Sircar's* excessive high-handedness or grasping policy. The lecturer has said that a more immediate cause was fanaticism working on minds already inflamed against us from a sense of wrong, and so undoubtedly it was; but I think in our superiority we often misunderstand what fanatical outbreaks mean. It is more than religious exaltation. The early Christians had that, and submitted to martyrdom gladly. Fanaticism is religious intolerance excited into reckless action. Half Christendom had it for hundreds of years, and employed itself in killing and burning the other half. All I wish to say is that fanaticism has its good points in a good cause—it is useful as an incitement to bravery, and had much the same effect upon the tribesmen as Findlater's pipes upon the gallant soldiers who rushed across the bullet-swept zone at Dargai. After touching on the present war in the Soudan with reference to the same subject, Mr. Thorburn said that the *mullahs* would have proclaimed a holy war against the aggressive infidels in vain had not the tribesmen been convinced that we meant to annex their country. Their *mullahs* were in luck, for a number of circumstances aided them—(1) The Amir's pamphlets; (2) rumours of victories by the head of the Moslem

world; and (3) dear food in the hills. The speaker here drew attention to the fact that the Afghan War of 1877 was preceded by a severe famine in the Punjab, and wondered how far the late risings had been affected by the scarcity of food. Having referred to the events which preceded Captain Barton's recall from Lundi Kotal to Peshawar, Mr. Thorburn said: A few more suspenseful days went by and then, on August 23, swarms of Afridis beset and surrounded the various posts in the Khyber Pass, and took them—the day was one of pain, shame, and humiliation to every Englishman in India. (Prolonged cheering.) We had 12,000 troops at the mouth of the Pass, or within easy reach, and we allowed our own posts to fall one after another. Public opinion holds that Captain Barton's recall was a blunder. He was ordered to desert his men. I think there is no case in history of a commander being so ordered. If Lundi Kotal was too hot for Captain Barton, it was too hot for his men. Public opinion holds that we should have reinforced the garrisons in the Pass and prevented the Afridi risings. Whether this was possible a civilian cannot well decide, but it is impossible to avoid contrasting this episode and the inaction of the Peshawar authorities with the action of Lord Roberts in 1879, who, with 6,000 men and a scanty transport, invaded hostile Afghanistan and captured Cabul. (Tremendous cheers.) During ten critical days in August I met General Nicholson and Colonel Warburton almost every afternoon and discussed the situation. In reply to our questions, the latter said that his Khyberis would be true to their salt and fight for us. But latterly, when he found they were to be deserted, he said they would be overwhelmed, and they were. Instead of fraternising with their co-religionists and clansmen, they fought bravely, though deserted by two officers who should have been with them—Captain Barton and Mahomed Aslam Khan. At the close of his speech Mr. Thorburn said the broad teaching of the story of Tirah is the condemnation of the expansion policy as impracticable and intolerable for necessitous India, from its great costliness and utter hopelessness of finality. (Prolonged cheering.)

The feature of the speech (says the *Times of India*) was its impressive and clever delivery. Some remarks have been naturally termed too bold, but the speaker at all events gained an extraordinary hold on the audience in a manner granted to no other speaker after the lecture.

Sir James Westland rose at once and began by saying that when he heard the applause which greeted the last speaker's remarks he hardly believed he could be in Simla. He thought he must be attending a meeting of the National Congress. (Laughter and applause.)

Commenting on Mr. Thorburn's speech, the *Bombay Gazette* writes:—The event of the evening was the challenge of the frontier policy of the Government of which the Tirah expedition was the outcome by the late Commissioner of Rawal Pindi. Mr. Thorburn certainly has the courage of his convictions. His energetic speech, we are told, fell like a bombshell on the assembly, which included several members of the Government of India. He compared the policy of expansion on the North-West frontier to a flimsy inflammable structure that had caught fire, and in burning cost the country two thousand lives and two and a-half millions sterling. The lost millions, Mr. Thorburn said with equal force and truth, were got by starving the civil administration. But what was even worse was the wholesale and reckless impressment of men and animals for transport purposes. Mr. Thorburn, who is in a position to know the facts, affirms that for this campaign a hundred thousand animals were taken from their owners, while not one-sixth of the number were sent to the frontier. This sweeping application of the press gang, as Mr. Thorburn says, would be in any case hard upon the population; but it is made intolerable in the Punjab by the absence of system, organisation and method, which of course means that the requisition falls crushingly in some districts while others escape. If the necessities of the service can only be supplied by requisitioning the villagers for cattle and horses and ponies, and drivers to attend them, then the example of the European military States should be followed, and the burden distributed equally over the whole country, or at all events over the whole of the province nearest the seat of war. In Germany and France horses fit for the cavalry or for draft are registered, and their owners are required to give their services in time of war according to a fixed tariff, each district being bound to supply a certain quota. The waste of animal life consequent on the present practice of impressing all cattle at sight and handing them over to the care of men who, impressed in the same haphazard fashion, and have no interest in caring for or preserving the animals given into their charge, adds enormously to the waste and cost of military expeditions. According to Sir James Westland we have not yet seen the last of these frontier wars, so this matter deserves the serious attention of Parliament. Mr. Thorburn waxed indignant at the manner in which the Khyber forts were abandoned when the Afridis were mustering to attack them. Captain Barton, recalled to Peshawar when the danger grew pressing, in vain protested that the loyal Afridis holding the posts in the Khyber would be overwhelmed, and urged that he should be permitted to return with reinforcements. Twelve thousand troops were available within a day's march; but the garrisons were left to their fate. Mr. Thorburn, we have reason to know, is not alone in holding that August 23 was a day of shame and humiliation for the British raj. When he declared that such was his belief he had the sympathy and the applause of a Simla audience, which cheered, as Sir James Westland remarked, as if it had been a meeting of the National Congress. But it was not by any means a Congress meeting; largely composed of military men, it represented the prevalent opinion of the Cantonments of Peshawar and Rawal Pindi. Sir James resents the imputation that it was shameful to abandon the garrisons in the Pass to their fate. The Khyber Rifles, he argues, are not soldiers of the British Empire; they are soldiers of the Afridis, who had engaged to protect the pass, and who were intending to withdraw their own men and make war on the British. This theory was not understood by the Khyber Rifles, who held to their belief that they were soldiers of the Sircar, whose salt they ate, and fought gallantly against their own kith and kin until they were overwhelmed, as Captain Barton predicted. It has never been denied that the large force near at hand could have defeated the tribesmen and relieved the posts and their heroic garrisons. It has never been explained why that obvious course was not taken. Sir James Westland argues that in a state of war the question of advance and retirement must be left to military men. But it is well understood that had the question been left to military men in this instance, the garrisons would have been effectually reinforced and the pass firmly held. It was the Political Officer, who, apparently acting on orders from higher authority, interposed to prevent the general in command from moving a force to the threatened points and saving the situation. What was the object of this singular inaction in presence of a known danger? The suggestion has been made that the intention was to allow the movement of the tribes to develop, so as to furnish a reasonable pretext for lifting the purdah of the Tirah and annexing that desirable sanitarium, as it was then believed to be. It was regarded as a possible eyrie whence to survey the adjacent Afghan territory while dominating the whole of the mountainous region between the old and the new political frontier. If that were the motive, the hard and costly experience of the campaign showed that the Tirah is about as unsuitable a spot for a sanitarium and cantonment as could be conceived. The splendid open plateau counted upon has no existence; in its stead there are alternating hills and ravines, which make it a Paradise for tribesmen rightly struggling to be free, and the judicious sniper who knows how to watch and wait. It is not presumptuous to say that if the real character of the Tirah was known in August last as well as it is now, the Khyber posts would never have fallen into the hands of the Afridis, and there would have been no Tirah Campaign.

WANTED: PARLIAMENTARY CONTROL.

With reference to our remarks of last week upon India and Parliament, it may be interesting to reproduce the following article by Sir W. Wedderburn, M.P. The article, entitled "Edmund Burke and the Indian Bureaucracy," appeared in the *Bombay Gazette* so long ago as March 5, 1884, but it will be seen that it is by no means out of date:—

It is now exactly 100 years since the English Parliament made its most notable attempt to put a bit and a bridle in the mouth of the great Indian bureaucracy. In 1784 Mr. Fox's Bill "for the better government of India" was passed through the House of Commons by a majority of more than two to one in every division. And if it had become law a strong and independent Parliamentary control would have been established over the Executive in India. But the fall of the Coalition Ministry stopped the progress of the reformers; and, from a variety of political causes, the task has remained uncompleted to the present day. Now again the question is coming to the front. In the current number of the *Contemporary Review* the senior member for Manchester condemns the existing system of control exercised through the India Office as illusory and mischievous. He points out that in 1858, when the Crown took over India from the Company, the intention of Parliament was to create a constitutional check upon the power of the Indian bureaucracy, but that object was evidently not attained when the Indian Council was formed of fifteen leading members of the very bureaucracy which had to be checked. Mr. Slagg has, therefore, given notice in Parliament that he will call attention to the position and duties of the Council of India, and will move a resolution. There are also signs that the public, both general and commercial, are not satisfied with the constitution of the Indian Council, which is practically the court which decides all appeals preferred to England. The complaint is that the successful Indian official, after determining the policy in India, migrates to Westminster, and there sits in appeal on his own decisions. Such an arrangement is not according to ordinary ideas of business. It is in fact a historical "survival." And as there is reason to hope that Parliament will, at no

distant date, address itself to this great question—which underlies all other questions of Indian reform—and will overhaul the existing machinery for the transaction of Indian business in England, the time seems opportune for a historical retrospect, in order that we may refresh our memories regarding past events and recall to mind the principles laid down in those great Indian debates of the last century, in which Fox and Pitt, Burke, Sheridan, and Erskine took a leading part. They were giants in those days; and probably there never was a period in English history, before or since, in which a more general and sustained attention was given to Indian affairs. But specially important is it to keep in popular remembrance the words of Edmund Burke, whose fervour and eloquence laid the foundations of the nobler policy of England towards India—a policy regarding which there have been temporary back-slidings, but never with the consent and approval of the English people; a just and generous policy, which in our own day has received fresh vindication at the hands of Mr. Cobden and Mr. Bright.

With a view to this retrospect, let us first give a glance at the circumstances under which Mr. Fox's Bill was introduced. I will afterwards briefly summarise the arguments of Mr. Burke, showing (1) the natural and necessary evil of a foreign official rule; (2) the entire and essential unfitness of the Court of Directors to control their servants in India; and (3) the remedy to be applied.

Originally an association of merchant adventurers, trading under the protection of charters granted by the British Crown, the East India Company had acquired dominion over a territory greater in extent and more thickly populated than all the possessions of the British Crown put together. From being traders they had become despotic rulers; and grievous complaints had come to England as to the mode in which this rule had been exercised by their servants in India. On account of these complaints two Parliamentary Committees, the one secret, the other open, were appointed in 1781 to investigate the whole condition of British India, as well as the affairs of the Company, which were then in a bankrupt condition. These Committees made elaborate reports, all condemnatory of the Company's government, and disclosing transactions of great cruelty and oppression on the part of the high officials in India; and upon these reports the House of Commons passed resolutions for the immediate dismissal of the Governor-General and the Chief Justice of Bengal. The secret influence of the Court of Directors was very great, and they fought hard to preserve their patronage and power, and to screen their servants in India. But the facts proved were too serious to be put aside; and accordingly the Company was placed upon its trial. Thus in 1783 the situation was as follows (*vide* "History of England under George III.," by the Right Honourable W. Massey): "The Company lay under accusation of having cruelly and scandalously abused the privileges of rulers. Their principal servants had been inculpated of gross malversation by a unanimous resolution of the House of Commons; and the Company had nevertheless upheld their officers in spite of the opinion of Parliament and of the Ministers of the Crown. The administration of justice had been so notoriously and scandalously abused, that the Chief Judge had been dismissed, in spite of the Company, by the authority of the King's Government. Nor had the Company purchased material prosperity by the open violation of the principles on which civil government, nay, society itself, is based. Plunder and extortion had only relieved their immediate and temporary exigencies. The ordinary resources of India were unequal to satisfy the greedy adventurers who were spread over the land, and to maintain the military force which was necessary to support an arbitrary and iniquitous Government. The Company therefore came before Parliament as delinquents who had grossly abused their trust, and as bankrupts unable to perform their engagements."

Such being the condition of affairs, India formed the most prominent topic in the King's speech on opening the autumnal Session of 1783; and a few days later Mr. Fox introduced his Bill to suspend the powers of the Company, and to bring the affairs of India under constitutional control. His plan was to erect a great department of State which should be charged with the direction of the whole administration of India: all the political authority of the Company being transferred to seven Commissioners nominated in the first instance in the Act of Parliament, and afterwards to be appointed by the Crown. It was in support of this Bill, of which he was the reputed author, that Mr. Burke made his memorable speech on December 1, 1783. As a leading member of the Parliamentary Committees which had during two years investigated Indian affairs, he was able to speak with knowledge and authority; and he declared that all political power must be taken from the Company. No remedy of less stringency would avail, because the abuses of that power were "habitual, not accidental," and because they were "utterly incurable in the body as it then stood constituted." The two great facts with which Parliament had to deal were the oppressions of the Company's servants in India, and the entire failure of the Court of Directors in England to check these iniquities. So far from controlling the officials in India, the Directors were on terms of intimate alliance with the offenders, supporting them during their career in India, and afterwards screening them from punishment when they retired to England to enjoy their ill-gotten gains. And the reason of this was not far to seek. For the East India Company being a joint-stock concern, it was open to anyone to purchase a share in its management. Under the constitution of the Company the Directors were elected by the proprietors of Indian stock; so that by purchasing this stock the Indian officials and their friends were able to obtain a preponderating influence both in the Court of Proprietors and in the Court of Directors. Nominally the servants of the Company, they thus became its masters. It is easy to see how this arrangement suited the wrongdoers. By plunder and oppression they realised colossal fortunes in India, and invested a portion of this wealth in the purchase of India stock; thus securing the election of their own partisans as Directors of the Company. What chance of redress was there from a court so constituted? Justice was thus made a mockery. For when complaints of oppression reached England the hearing was before men who were the nominees and representatives of the delinquents. The object of the Bill was to strike at the very root of these evils by ousting these unjust judges, and by establishing a real and independent control in England over the Indian Executive. The control was to be a Parliamentary one, and it was to be exercised in a spirit of judicial impartiality.

From this outline of the surrounding circumstances we may now return to Mr. Burke's speech with reference to the three points above noted; and I will quote his words with reference to (1) *the natural and necessary evils of a foreign official rule.* In Mr. Burke's opinion the rule of a migratory foreign bureaucracy is worse than almost any form of indigenous government. Compared with the ferocious irruptions into India of the Arabs, Tartars, and Persians, our conquest no doubt involved little bloodshed. But the difference in favour of the first conquerors was this: the Asiatic conquerors very soon abated of their ferocity, because they made the conquered country their own. They rose or fell with the rise or fall of the territory they lived in. Fathers there deposited the hopes of their posterity, and children there beheld the monuments of their fathers. With many disorders, and with few political checks upon power, nature had still fair play; the sources of acquisition were not dried up; and therefore the trade, the manufactures, and the commerce of the country flourished. "But under the English Government all this order is reversed. The Tartar invasion was mischievous; but it is our protection which destroys India. It was their enmity, but it is our friendship. Our conquest there, after 20 years, is as crude as it was the first day. The Natives scarcely know what it is to see the grey head of an Englishman. Young men (boys almost) govern there, without society and without sympathy with the Natives. They have no more social habits with the people than if they still resided in England, nor, indeed, any species of intercourse but that which is necessary to making a sudden fortune, with a view to a remote settlement." It was the system he blamed, not the individuals: "There is nothing in the boys we send to India worse than in the boys whom we are whipping at school, or that we see trailing a pike or bending over a desk at home. But as English youths in India drink the intoxicating draught of authority and dominion before their heads are able to bear it, and as they are full grown in fortune long before they are ripe in principle, neither nature nor reason have opportunity to exert themselves for remedy of the excesses of their premature power." The doings of such crude administrators necessarily proved revolutionary, and destructive to the ancient institutions of the country: "I confess to you when first I came to know this business in its true nature and extent, my surprise did a little suspend my indignation. I was in a manner stupefied by the desperate boldness of a few obscure young men who tossed about, subverted, and tore to pieces, as if it were in the gambols of a boyish unluckiness and malice, the most established rights, and the most ancient and the most revered institutions, of ages and nations." Such are some of the unavoidable evils of a foreign bureaucracy, in no way responsible to the people over whom they rule. But besides these, special evils creep in where there is no strong and independent control. For a close service like that in India tends to form itself into cliques, which look more to personal advantage than to the public good. And such cliques cannot be checked except by a very strong and independent authority in England, by the punishment of greedy and unscrupulous ambition, and by assured protection to those who bring abuses to light. If there be no day of reckoning for official misdeeds committed in India, the service generally tends to become demoralised; "men will not look to Acts of Parliament, to regulations, to declarations, to votes, to resolutions. No, they are not such fools. They will ask, What is the road to power, credit, wealth, and honours? They will ask, What conduct ends in neglect, disgrace, poverty, exile? These will teach them the course which they are to follow. It is your distribution of these that will give the character and tone to your Government. All the rest is miserable grimace."

(2) *The entire and essential unfitness of the Court of Directors to control their servants in India.* I have already referred to the altered position of the Directors, who, nominally the masters, were the mere creatures of the Indian officials who had bought up the Company's shares: "The stock is bought up in qualifications. The vote is not to protect the stock, but the stock is

bought to acquire the vote; and the end of the vote is to cover and support, against justice, some man of power who has made an obnoxious fortune in India, or to maintain in power those who are actually employing it in the acquisition of such a fortune, and to avail themselves in return of his patronage, that he may shower the spoils of the East, 'barbaric pearl and gold,' on them, their families, and dependents. So that all the relations of the Company are not only changed, but inverted. The servants in India are not appointed by the Directors but the Directors are chosen by them. The seat of the supreme power is in Calcutta. The house in Leadenhall Street is nothing more than a 'change for their agents, factors, and deputies to meet in, to take care of their affairs and support their interests; and this so avowedly that we see the known agents of the delinquent servants marshalling and disciplining their forces, and the prime spokesmen in all their assemblies."

So far all parties in Parliament were agreed. No one denied the excesses of the officials in India, and no one denied the inefficacy of the controlling authorities in England. But as regards (3) *the remedy to be applied*, a wide difference arose between those who, like Mr. Burke, proposed to remove the authors of the evil, and those who proposed to continue the existing system under certain restrictions. On behalf of the opposition Mr. Dundas proposed that the management of Indian affairs should continue in the hands of the Company under "a more active control on the part of the Crown." Regarding the principle of this proposal Mr. Burke spoke as follows: "It is to recommit the government of India to the Court of Directors. Those who would commit the reformation of India to the destroyers of it are the enemies to that reformation. A right hon. gentleman says he would keep the present government of India in the Court of Directors, and would, to curb them, provide salutary regulations. Wonderful! That is, he would appoint the old offenders to correct the old offences, and he would render the vicious and the foolish wise and virtuous by salutary regulations. He would appoint the wolf as guardian of the sheep; but he has invented a curious muzzle, by which this protecting wolf shall not be able to open his jaws above an inch or two at the utmost. Thus his work is finished. But I tell the right hon. gentleman that controlled depravity is not innocence, and that it is not the labour of delinquency in chains that will correct abuses. If the undone people of India see their old oppressors in confirmed power, they will expect nothing but what they will certainly feel, a continuance, or rather an aggravation, of all their former sufferings. They look to the seat of power, and to the persons who fill it; and they despise these gentlemen's regulations as much as the gentlemen do who talk of them." Nor did Mr. Burke hope much from the proposed control to be exercised through the Ministers of the Crown; for under a system of party government he feared the effect of placing so vast a patronage as that of India in the hands of Ministers. "I am sure," he says, "that the influence of the Crown will by no means aid a reformation of this kind, which can neither be originated nor supported, but by the uncorrupt public virtue of the representatives of the people of England. Let it once get into the ordinary course of administration, and to me all hopes of reformation are gone."

The plan of Mr. Fox's Bill for controlling the Indian bureaucracy was a very different one. The power of control was to be taken from those who were the friends and nominees of the delinquents, and was to be placed in the hands of a strong and independent Commission appointed by Parliament from among the most trusted public men in England: men unconnected with Indian intrigues, and prepared to enforce publicly and with judicial impartiality the broad principles of justice and good government. The design and main scope of the Bill was "to regulate the administration of India upon the principles of a Court of Judicature, and to exclude, as far as human prudence can exclude, all possibility of a corrupt partiality, in appointing to office, or supporting in office, or covering from enquiry and punishment, any person who has abused or shall abuse his authority. At the board, as appointed and regulated by this Bill, reward and punishment cannot be shifted and reversed by a whisper. That Commission becomes fatal to cabal, to intrigue, and to secret representation, those instruments of the ruin of India." The Bill "calls in persons in nowise concerned with any act censured by Parliament; persons generated with, and for, the reform, of which they are themselves the most essential part. To these the chief regulations in the Bill are helps, not fetters, for they are authorities to support, not regulations to restrain them. The tenure is for four years, or during their good behaviour. That good behaviour is as long as they are true to the principles of the Bill; and the judgment is in either House of Parliament. This is the tenure of your judges; and the valuable principle of the Bill is to make a judicial administration for India."

By these principles Mr. Fox's Bill was designed to provide for Indian affairs "an administration at once protecting and stable." Unhappily for India, and for England, this great scheme of reform, this "Magna Charta of Hindustan," fell to the ground with the fall of the Ministry which originated it. And shortly afterwards Mr. Pitt passed his India Bill, which was in effect the plan proposed by Mr. Dundas, and so strongly denounced by Mr. Burke; the administration was still to be conducted in the name of the Company; the Court of Directors retaining all their patronage, while the Crown dictated the policy through the Board of Control. This cumbrous double Government, which continued most of the vices of the old system, was not designed for a permanent institution. But the force of political circumstances, little connected with Indian interests, prolonged its existence until the Mutinies of 1857, when the Crown assumed the direct administration. And even then the change was one of nomenclature rather than of principle. For the independent Parliamentary control which formed the central feature of Mr. Burke's scheme was not revived. The transfer was effected in a hasty manner during a great crisis, and the arrangements were of a temporary and make-shift kind. Indeed, as regards the interests represented, the new Indian Council was little more than the old Court of Directors under a new name. This will be apparent when we remember that Mr. Burke's chief practical objection to the Directors was that they were the representatives of the Indian bureaucracy which it was their duty to control. And exactly the same objection may be taken to the Indian Council, which is regularly recruited from the leading members of the Indian official class. In fact it may be said that the last state of the control is worse than the first. For, whereas the Court of Directors was filled with the nominees of the dominant Indian officials, the Indian Council is filled with these officials themselves.

I propose at another time to make some suggestions as to the best method of applying the principles laid down by Mr. Burke to the present situation. The elimination of official predominance; an infusion of wholesome Parliamentary influences; publicity in the proceedings; and a procedure analogous to that of a court of justice: these are conditions of an effectual control as necessary and as opportune to-day as they were 100 years ago. But in addition to these, the progress of time and events, and of enlightenment, has rendered one more condition indispensable; and that is, the reasonable representation of Native interests and opinion. How this can best be effected is a question requiring much consideration. In March, 1858, in his original scheme for an Indian Council, Mr. Disraeli, then Chancellor of the Exchequer, proposed that four seats at the Council Board in London should be reserved for members elected by a "special Indian constituency." And in any measure of reform it will be necessary to consider how a true Indian constituency can best be formed and by what process of election the best representation can be obtained, and the best protection secured, for Indian interests and Indian feelings. This matter must be dealt with in a spirit of broad and far-sighted statesmanship. As observed by Lord Palmerston, the whole question is far too serious a one to be made the shuttlecock of political parties. And on this point we may conclude with the words of Mr. Burke: "For my part, sir, I put all indirect considerations wholly out of mind. My sole question, on each clause of the Bill, amounts to this:—Is the measure proposed required by the necessities of India?"

Imperial Parliament.

Friday, July 15.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

PETITIONS.

East India (Contagious Diseases),—Petitions against State regulation; from Great Yarmouth, Port Sunlight, Birstall, Clifton Down, Leeds, and Glasgow; to lie upon the Table.

THE INDIAN BUDGET.

Mr. BALFOUR having made a statement as to the course of public business,

Mr. SWIFT MACNEILL asked: When does the right hon. gentleman propose to take the Indian Budget?

Mr. BALFOUR: I think some time will elapse before that is taken.

Monday, July 18.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

PETITIONS.

East India (Contagious Diseases),—Four Petitions from Bristol, against State regulation; to lie upon the Table.

WRITING PAPER FOR THE INDIA OFFICE.

Mr. JAMES LOWTHER asked the Secretary of State for India, by whose authority writing paper for official use at the India Office had been purchased abroad to the exclusion of British and Indian manufacturers and workmen.

Lord G. HAMILTON: All writing paper used at the India Office is procured from the Stationery Office, and the India Office has no control over the sources of supply. I have, however, ascertained that it is all manufactured in the United Kingdom with the exception of what is used for typewriting purposes. This has hitherto been of a pattern which, I believe, is supplied only by the American firm which makes the typewriting machines that are used in the public service generally; but, if the Stationery Office can supply a satisfactory article of British manufacture, it will be readily accepted by the India Office.

THE MURDER OF MR. WILDE.

Mr. HERBERT ROBERTS asked the Secretary of State for India,

whether he had received official confirmation of the reported murder by Pathans on the 12th instant of Mr. F. S. Wilde, an engineer employed upon the extension of the Bengal-Assam Railway, in the North Cachan Hills:

And, whether he had any information as to the circumstances under which the murder took place.

Lord G. HAMILTON: Mr. Wilde was not in the service of Government, and I have not received and am not likely to receive any official information as to his death. But, having communicated privately with the Assam-Bengal Railway Company I regret to say that I have reason to believe the report of his murder by Pathan workmen employed on the railway to be true. The Company have no information as to the circumstances under which the murder took place.

THE COMMITTEE ON CURRENCY. PUBLICATION OF CERTAIN EVIDENCE.

Sir H. H. FOWLER asked the Secretary of State for India whether he had decided that the evidence taken before the Indian Currency Committee should be laid before Parliament before the prorogation.

Lord G. HAMILTON: I am quite ready to agree to the suggestion of the Committee upon Indian Currency of which the right hon. gentleman is Chairman, that the evidence and information which up to the close of the Session they will have collected, should then be published.

Tuesday, July 19.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THE SUGAR INDUSTRY IN INDIA.

Sir HOWARD VINCENT asked the Secretary of State for India, if he could state what was the amount of sugar capable of being produced from cane in India, how many factories there were, what was the capital embarked in them, and the amount of rent they paid to the Indian Government for water power:

And, to what extent foreign bounty-fed sugar was imported last year on foreign bounty-fed vessels.

Lord G. HAMILTON: The estimated amount of cane sugar produced in India during an ordinary season has been variously estimated at from 3½ to 5 million tons.

The number of large sugar factories shown in the latest Indian returns was 13; the return of capital for these factories is incomplete; for those factories which made returns, the capital employed ranged from 1½ lakhs to 16 lakhs apiece. Most of the sugar produced in India is made at small village works where bullock power is employed. I have no information regarding any sugar factories worked by water power or paying rent to Government for such power.

The quantity of bounty-fed sugar imported into India during the year ending March, 1898, was 107,452 tons, or about 2½ times the total of the previous year. I have no information to show how much of this sugar came in bounty-fed vessels.

INDIA AND IMPERIAL PENNY POSTAGE.

Sir MANCHERJEE BHOWNAGGREE asked the Secretary to the Treasury, as representing the Postmaster General, if the Government of India has expressed itself in favour of including that country in the Imperial Penny Postage scheme:

What share was borne by her at present of the postal contract between England and India:

And, whether, in case she was to be included in the new scheme, it was intended to make any alteration in the contract and in the amounts payable by the two countries respectively under it.

Mr. HANBURY: At the recent Postal Congress the representative of British India made no announcement on the question of the adoption of the penny postage scheme by the Government of India, nor has the Postmaster-General since received any notification from that Government on the point. The contribution of the Indian Government towards the cost of the service under the old contract with the Peninsular and Oriental Company was £60,600 per annum. The present contract is for seven years from February 1, and is not susceptible of alteration on the ground of a change in the postage. The question of the contribution to be paid by the Indian Government under this contract is not yet decided; but, of course, if penny postage between England and India were adopted, India would have to bear her share of any loss arising from its adoption.

OPERATIONS IN BURMA.

Captain NORTON asked the Under-Secretary of State for War, whether he would consider the advisability of awarding the Burma medal to the troops who took part in the operations round Sima against the Katchin tribes, north-east of Bhamo, in Upper Burma, during the cold season of 1892-3, seeing that a large number of officers and men were killed and wounded, that rewards were bestowed upon several officers, and that the period during which the operations lasted was allowed to count as war service.

Lord G. HAMILTON: As I stated in reply to a question in the House on July 14, 1896, after full consideration I can see no reasons for modifying the decision arrived at in 1894 not to grant the India medal to the troops who took part in the operations in Burma and the Chin Hills in 1892-93, and to that decision I must adhere.

THE INDIA OFFICE (STORE DEPOT) BILL.

The India Office (Store Depôt) Bill, was considered in Committee, and reported, without amendment. The Bill was read the third time, and passed.

Thursday, July 21.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

PETITION.

East India (Contagious Diseases), — Petition from Bedminster, against State regulation; to lie upon the Table.

STATE REGULATION OF VICE.

Mr. JAMES STUART asked the Secretary of State for India, whether, in the draft cantonment rules sanctioned by him in his despatch of July 8, 1897, it was provided that any medical practitioner who in the course of his practice became cognisant of the existence in any person of any infectious or contagious disorder should be bound under penalty to give information to the cantonment authority:

And, whether the Indian Government had given any reason for omitting this provision in the cantonment regulations issued by them under date October 15, 1897, and now in operation.

Lord G. HAMILTON: The Government of India were of opinion that the rule to which this question refers was, as originally drafted, too wide, and that it required modification. As, however, it was desirable to issue the rules without delay, they decided to publish them without this particular rule, which they reserved for further consideration; but it was and is their intention to restore it in a modified form. This will shortly be done, and I will then lay it on the Table of the House.

Mr. JAMES STUART also asked the Secretary of State for India, whether he would lay upon the Table of the House the letter issued by the Government of India, Military Department, dated November 20, 1897, which purported to state explicitly and in practical detail the policy of the Government of India with respect to the future treatment of venereal disease in cantonments.

Lord G. HAMILTON: Steps have already been taken to lay the paper in question on the Table of the House.

THE DEATH OF DR. SIRCAR.

EUROPEAN SOLDIERS SENTENCED.

(FROM OUR OWN CORRESPONDENT.)

CALCUTTA, July 21.

The European soldiers charged with the murder of Dr. Sircar have been convicted by a special jury, consisting exclusively of Englishmen, of causing grievous bodily hurt. The Chief Justice sentenced each to seven years' rigorous imprisonment, remarking that the jury had taken a merciful view of the case. The judge summed up for a conviction on the higher offence of manslaughter.—*By Cable.*

ET CAETERA.

When the last mail left India the date on which the Famine Commission will be broken up had not been fixed, but it was expected to be before the end of July.

Sir Henry Fowler's Committee on the Currency proposals of the Indian Government will adjourn for the holidays on Tuesday next. The evidence so far taken by the Committee will, it is stated, be published in a few days.

The P. and O. ss. "Isis" left Port Said at 6.30 p.m. on Wednesday for Brindisi with the Indian mail.

The Secretary of State for India has appointed Mr. Arthur U. Wollaston to be Registrar and Superintendent of Records at the India Office in the room of Mr. Fredk. C. Danvers, who has retired under the age limit. The salary attached to the appointment is £1,000 a year.

Sir Martin Le Marchant Gosselin, now Secretary at the Embassy in Paris, is about to be appointed an additional Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs. It is stated that the duties to be allocated to him have not yet been definitely decided upon.

The complexion put upon this new departure at the Foreign Office by the writer of the "Letter from the Linkman" in *Truth* is that of a declaration of war by Lord Salisbury against Mr. Chamberlain. "Marmaduke" says that Sir Martin Gosselin's duty will be to deal with international questions connected with Africa. This, he adds, will put a stop to the interference of Mr. Chamberlain, who has frequently of late trespassed upon Foreign Office ground.

Mr. Thomas Owen, who has so suddenly lost his life in Wales, is the fourth member of the present Parliament who has met with a violent death. Mr. Thomas Fielden, formerly member for Middleton, died on a Perthshire Moor while engaged in grouse shooting last autumn. More recently still, Sir H. Havelock-Allan was killed in the neighbourhood of the Khyber Pass; while less than two years ago Mr. Byron Reed was thrown from a trap at Ventnor, and killed. Already this year ten members of Parliament have died, or more than in any complete year since 1892.

Sir Monier-Williams, Professor of Sanskrit in the University of Oxford, and Lady Monier-Williams celebrated their golden wedding on Wednesday, at the residence of their eldest son, Mr. M. F. Monier-Williams, at Chessington. There was a service in the village Church, at which only Sir Monier and Lady Monier-Williams and their children and grandchildren were present, and in the afternoon there was a garden party, at which a large number of guests were present.

THE INDIAN NATIONAL CONGRESS.

OFFICERS IN INDIA.

PRESIDENT (elected 1897):
HON. C. SANKARAN NAIR.

GENERAL SECRETARY:
A. O. HUME, C.B., ROTHNEY CASTLE, SIMLA; and THE CHALET, UPPER NORWOOD, S.E.

JOINT GENERAL SECRETARY (in India):
D. E. WACHA, 84, HORNBY ROW, BOMBAY.

STANDING COUNSEL:
Bengal, W. C. BONNERJEE;
Bombay, PHEROZSHAH MEHTA;
Madras, RAI BAHADUR ANANDU CHARLU.

BRITISH COMMITTEE.

Sir W. WEDDERBURN, Bart., M.P., *Chairman*.
W. C. BONNERJEE.
A. M. BOSE.
W. S. CAINE.
G. B. CLARK, M.P.
A. O. HUME, C.B.
J. SEYMOUR KEAY.
H. S. KHALIL.
DADABHAI NAOROJI.
J. HERBERT ROBERTS, M.P.
C. E. SCHWANN, M.P.
ROBINSON SOUTTAR, M.P.
ALFRED WEBB.
W. MARTIN WOOD.

OFFICES: 84 AND 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, LONDON, S.W.

TELEGRAPHIC ADDRESS: "INCAS, LONDON."

NAME OF CIRCLE.	JURISDICTION.	NAME AND ADDRESS OF SECRETARY OR SECRETARIES.
1. Calcutta	Presidency, Burdwan and Chittagong Divisions (*except* Murshidabad District) Assam & Orissa	J. Ghosal, Esq., Nolin Behari Sircar, Esq., and Raja Binoy Krishna Deb Bahadur; 11, Clive Street, Calcutta.
2. Dacca...	Dacca District	Babu Sarat Chandra Bose, Pleader, Rajar Deory, Dacca.
3. Maimansingh ...	Maimansingh District	Babu Anath Bandhu Guha, Sec., Maimansingh Association, Maimansingh.
4. Faridpur	Faridpur District	Babu Ambica Churn Mozumdar, Pleader, Faridpur.
5. Barisal	Bakarganj District	Babu Awsini Kumar Dutt, Pleader, Barisal.
6. Rangpur	Rangpur District	Joges Chandra Das Gupta, Pleader, Rangpur.
7. Dinajpur	Dinajpur District	Babu Lalit Chandra Sen, B.A., B.L., Dinajpur.
8. Pabna...	Pabna District	Babu Harendra Narain Roy, B.L., Pabna.
9. Bogra	Bogra District	Babu Peary Sunker Das Gupta, L.M.S., Medical Practitioner, Bogra.
10. Jalpaiguri	Jalpaiguri District	Babu Umagati Roy, Jalpaiguri.
11. Rampur-Beauleah...	Rajshahyi District	Dr. Chandra Nath Chowdry, Rampur-Beauleah.
12. Berhampur	Murshidabad District	Babu Boikunt Nath Sen, Berhampur, Dist. Murshidabad.
13. Bhagalpur	Bhagalpur Division (*except* Purneah District)...	Babus Siva Sankar Sahai and Surya Prosad, Bhagalpur.
14. Purneah	Purneah District	Babu Jogendra Nath Mukerji, Pleader, Purneah.
15. Chutia-Nagpur ...	Chutia-Nagpur Division	Rai Jodu Nath Mukerji, Pleader, Hazaribagh.
16. Behar...	Patna Division (excluding the Muzaffarpur and Gaya Districts)	Babu Banwari Lal, Patna City.
17. Muzaffarpur ...	Muzaffarpur District...	Babu Preo Nath Mukherji, B.L., Vakil, Muzaffarpur.
18. Gaya	Gaya District	Babus Nand Kishore Lal and Upendra Chandra Mittra, Gaya.
19. N.-W. Provinces ..	North-Western Provinces	Secretary, Standing Committee, Johnstonganj, Allahabad.
Sub-divisions of the N. W. P. for the purpose of distributing "INDIA." Name of Sub-division.	Jurisdiction.	
Gorakhpur ...	Gorakhpur Division	A. Nundy, Esq., Gorakhpur.
Benares ...	Benares Division (*except* Mirzapur District)	Pandit Channu Lal, Benares City.
Mirzapur ...	Mirzapur District	Babu Sri Ram, Mirzapur.
Cawnpur ...	Cawnpur District	Pandit Perthi Nath, Cawnpur.
Bareilly ...	Bareilly District	The Secretary, Congress Committee, Bareilly.
Moradabad	Moradabad District	N. C. Bose, Esq., Moradabad.
Saharanpur	Saharanpur District	Babu Anand Swarupa, B.A., LL.B., Vakil, Saharanpur
Meerut ...	Meerut District	Babu Prahlad Singh, Meerut.
Aligarh ...	Aligarh District	Hafiz M. Abdur Rahim, Esq., Aligarh.
Agra ...	Agra Division	Pandit Tulsi Ram Misra, Mursan, Dist. Aligarh.
Allahabad	All places in the N.W.P. not above enumerated	Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya, Sec. for the N.-W. P. Circle, Allahabad.
20. Oudh	Oudh	Munshi Ganga Prasad Varma, Office of the *Advocate*, Lucknow.
21. Punjab	The Punjab	Lala Jrishi Ram, Secretary, Congress Committee, Lahore; Babu Chetan Anand, Multan; Bhagat Ram, Esq., Barrister-at-Law, Jalandhar City; Lala Murli Dhar, Pleader, Ambala City; Babu Kedar Nath, Pleader, Delhi; and Pandit Perthi Nath, Pleader, Peshawur.
22. Bombay	Bombay Island, Colaba, Thana & Ratnagiri Dists.	D. E. Wacha, Esq., Presidency Association, Bombay.
23. Sind	Sind	Tahilram Khemchand, Esq., Pleader, Karachi; Himatsing G. Advani, Esq., Shikarpur; and Hiranand Khemsing, Esq., Haidarabad.
24. Ahmedabad... ...	Ahmedabad, Kaira and Panch Mahals Districts, Cutch and Kathiawar, Rajkot	Rao Saheb Kesavalal Motilal and Ratanlal Ranchhoddas, B.A., Pleaders, Ahmedabad.
25. Surat	Surat and Broach Districts, with Baroda	Hardevram Nanabhai Haridas, Esq., and Bhagubai Dayabhai, Esq., Surat.
26. Sholapur	Sholapur District	Vishem R. Lele, Esq., Sholapur.
27. Bijapur	Bijapur District	Krishnaji Raghunath Natu, Esq., B.A., LL.B., Bijapur.
28. Dharwar	Dharwar District	Sec., Standing Congress Committee, Dharwar, and Raghunath A. Sule, Esq., Hubli.
29. Satara	Satara District...	Raghunath Pandurang Karandikar, Esq., High Court Pleader, Satara.
30. Ahmadnagar ...	Ahmadnagar District	Shankar Gangadhar Ranade, Mohenlal Hiralal and Kashinath Vinayak Bhawe, Pleaders, Ahmadnagar.
31. Poona	Poona, Nasik, & Khandesh Districts	Laxuman Raghunath Gokhale, Esq., Pleader, Poona.
32. Ichalkaranji... ...	Southern Mahratta Country	Sadashiv Ramchandra Apte, Ichalkaranji, near Kolhapur, S.M. Country.
33. Berar	Berar	R. N. Mudholkar, Esq., and B. H. Karandikar, Esq., Pleaders, High Court, Amraoti.
34. Nagpur	Central Provinces	Kesava Gopal Tamhan, M.A., Morris College, Nagpur.
35. Madras	Madras, Chingleput, N. and S. Arcot, Nellore and Native States	M.r.ry. V. Ryru Nambiar, High Court Vakil, Madras; M.r.ry. S. H. Belgrami, Barrister-at-Law, Madras, Secs., Mahajana Sabha.
36. Madura	Madura and Tinnevelli	M.r.ry. G. Srinivasa Row Garu, Pleader, Madura; M.r.ry. K. R. Gurusami Iyer, District [Court Pleader, Tinnevelli.
37. Tanjore	Tanjore and Trichinopoli	M.r.ry. S. Ramachandra Iyer Aol, High Court Vakil, Tanjore; M.r.ry. K. Vasudeva Iyengar, Mirasidar, Srirangam; M.r.ry. N. Vydianadha Iyer, M.A., Kumbakonum; M.r.ry. P. Rathna Sabapathy Pillai, Pleader, Negapatam.
38. Bellary	Bellary, Anantapur, Cuddapah, and Karnul ...	M.r.ry. Srinivasa Row Garu, B.A., Pleader, Bellary; M.r.ry. Dhone Subba Row Garu, Pensioned Deputy Tahsildar, Karnul.; Hon. Rai Bahadur C. Jambulinga Mudaliar, B.A., M.L., Cuddapah; M.r.ry. P. Kesava Pillai, Pleader, Gooty.
39. Malabar	Malabar and Kanara...	Hon. C. Sankara Nair, Poonamalli Road, Egmore, Madras; M.r.ry. K. C. Manavikraman Raja, Secretary, Kerala Mahajana Sabha, Calicut; M.r.ry. T. Viraraghava Iyer, Palghat; M.r.ry. T. C. Naraina Kurup, High Court Vakil, Tellicheri; Rao Bahadur N. Shiva Row, Pleader, Mangalore.
40. Salem	Salem	Hon. C. Vijiaraghava Chariar, B.A., Pleader, Salem.
41. Coimbatore	Coimbatore and Nilghiris	M.r.ry. C. M. Padmanabha Chariar, B.A., B.L., Coimbatore.
42. Ganjam	Ganjam, Vizagapatam, Godavari, and Kristna	M.r.ry. B. Surianarayana Rao Garu, Vizagapatam; M.r.ry. C. Rungachariar [illegible] Court Vakil, Musulipatam; M.r.ry. D. Subramaniem, Pleader, Cocona[illegible]

TO SUBSCRIBERS.—Intending Subscribers to "INDIA" should communicate [illegible]ondon Office. All the gentlemen so [illegible]eman whose name appears as Secretary to the Congress Committee for the district in which they resi[illegible] of spare copies of "INDIA" to enable them named are in monthly correspondence with England, and re[illegible] the Journal, which are payable in advance. They will to obtain new Subscribers, and are authorised to [illegible]scribers who have paid, so that all such Subscribers may receive also from time to time transmit to [illegible] [illegible]oscribers are requested in giving notice of any alteration in their address, to their copies direct from [illegible] wrapper of their copie of "INDIA." quote the numb[illegible]

[illegible] ADVERTISERS.—Intending Advertisers should apply for terms to any of the following: The Manager, "INDIA," 84, Palace Chambers, Westminster, London, S.W.; The Secretaries, Calcutta Congress Committee Offices, 11, Clive Street, Calcutta; D. E. WACHA, Esq., Presidency Association, Bombay; The Secretaries, Mahajana Sabha, Madras; JRISHA RAM, Esq., Secretary Congress Committee, Lahore; Secretary, Congress Committee, Johnstonganj, Allahabad.

NOTICE TO ADVERTISERS.

Applications for rates for Advertisements in "INDIA," should be made to

THE MANAGER,
84 & 85, Palace Chambers,
Westminster, S.W.

Advertisements should reach the Office n ot later than first post on Thursday in order to ensure insertion in the issue of the following day.

Just Published. Price 2s. 6d. net.

INDIAN CURRENCY.

BY

HENRY DUNNING MACLEOD, M.A.,
of the Inner Temple, Barrister-at-Law.

LONGMAN, GREEN & CO.,
LONDON, NEW YORK, AND BOMBAY.

With Portrait, Map, and Illustrations, 8vo, 10s. 6d. net.

GENERAL SIR RICHARD MEADE AND THE FEUDATORY STATES OF CENTRAL AND SOUTHERN INDIA:

A RECORD OF FORTY-THREE YEARS' SERVICE AS SOLDIER, POLITICAL OFFICER, AND ADMINISTRATOR.

By THOMAS HENRY THORNTON, C.S.I., D.C.L.,
Sometime Foreign Secretary to the Government of India, Author o "The Life and Work of Colonel Sir Robert Sandeman."

LONGMAN, GREEN & CO.,
LONDON, NEW YORK, AND BOMBAY.

THE INDIAN NATIONAL CONGRESS:
ITS AIMS AND JUSTIFICATION.

[Being a reprint of certain articles on the subject in the *Statesman and Friend of India*.]

BY ROBERT KNIGHT.

CALCUTTA: Published at the *Statesman* Office.

The above will be sent to any address on receipt of 1d. stamp for postage. Application should be made to the Manager of "INDIA," 84 & 85, Palace Chambers, Westminster, S.W.

DR. T. N. GHOSE'S

PECTORAL BALSAM.

A BOON TO SUFFERERS FROM ALL DISORDERS AND COMPLAINTS OF THE LUNGS AND CHEST.

For Cold in the Head, Coughs, Hoarseness, Asthma, Hooping Cough, Bronchitis, Sore Throat.

DR. W. VENOR says: "I have used it myself and prescribed it for many patients, and can very strongly recommend it for Bronchitis, Asthma, Indigestion. It will not cure Asthma or Indigestion, but a single dose I have found gives an immediate relief.—31st March, 1889.

P. C. GHOSE & CO., NEW MEDICAL HALL, MEERUT.

English Newspapers, Books, Magazines, &c.

WILLIAM DAWSON & SONS, Ltd.,

WHOLESALE AND EXPORT BOOKSELLERS, STATIONERS, AND NEWSVENDORS,

CANNON HOUSE, BREAM'S BUILDINGS, LONDON, ENGLAND.

(Established 1809.)

Orders for ENGLISH BOOKS, MAGAZINES, PERIODICALS, NEWSPAPERS, &c., punctually attended to, carefully packed, and despatched by first mails to Australia, Tasmania, New Zealand, India, China, and throughout the world.

Remittance, or reference for payment in London, to accompany all orders. Advertisements and notices of Births, Marriages, and Deaths inserted in all the English Newspapers. Send for a Complete List of English and Foreign Newspapers, Magazines, &c. Also for Catalogue of Works and Text Books in the Oriental Languages.

6d. Weekly.] THE

"HOME NEWS"

Is the BEST SUMMARY of EUROPEAN INTELLIGENCE.

SPECIALLY PREPARED FOR

INDIA, CEYLON, CHINA, and AUSTRALASIA.

PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY.

THE "HOME NEWS" Will keep readers posted up in all Political, Social, Literary, Dramatic, and other movements.

THE "HOME NEWS" Contains Original and Special Matter, and gives the cream of the European Newspapers.

Ask the Local Newsagent to get it, or send Subscription direct to the Publisher.

Subscription, including postage, payable in advance—

Period.	All places abroad.	In United Kingdom.
Three Months...	£0 7 7	£0 7 1
Six Months	0 15 9	0 14 1
One Year	1 10 4	1 8 2

CHEQUES AND P.O. ORDERS TO BE MADE TO THE ORDER OF GRINDLAY & CO.

OFFICES: 66, PARLIAMENT STREET, LONDON, S.W.

In Crown 8vo, cloth, price **7s. 6d.**

THOMAS BEST JERVIS,

LIEUT.-COL. BOMBAY ENGINEERS, H.E.I.C.'s SERVICE, DIRECTOR OF THE TOPOGRAPHICAL AND STATISTICAL WAR DEPARTMENT.

A Biography by his Son, W. P. JERVIS.

"The biographer has done his work with judgment and discretion, and has produced a work of considerable general utility and interest." *Glasgow Herald.*

"A faithful autobiography. As being a centenary tribute by his son, there is much relating to the condition of India in former times, the better enabling us to judge of the progress manifested in that country of late years."—*Western Daily Mercury.*

ELLIOT STOCK, 62, PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON, E.C.

"INDIA." Vol. VIII. (1897.)

NOW READY.

BOUND IN CLOTH (post free), **8/6**, ***net cash.***

To be obtained at the Offices,
84 & 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, S.W.

TOOTH-ACHE

CURED INSTANTLY BY

BUNTER'S NERVINE

Prevents Decay, Saves Extraction. Sleepless Nights Prevented.

Neuralgic Headaches and all Nerve Pains removed by BUNTERS NERVINE. All Chemists, 1s. 1½d.

"Louene"

A Simple, Safe, & Reliable NERVE SEDATIVE.

For NEURALGIA, HEADACHE, FACEACHE, SLEEPLESSNESS, and NERVOUS Troubles.

GUARANTEED PURELY VEGETABLE AND NEITHER OPIATE NOR NARCOTIC IN ITS ACTION.

The EARL OF MOUNT-CASHELL writes: "Acted like magic, and relieved pain almost immediately."

The COUNTESS OF BANTRY writes: "A good remedy for ... ...ness."

PRICES, 2/9 and 4/6 per bottle. Post free in the United Kingdom, 3/- and 4/9. Foreign postage extra.

Pamphlet, containing many valuable Medical and other Testimonials, post free on application to

THE LOUENE CO., 43, KING WILLIAM STREET, LONDON, E.C.

Printed by A. BONNER, 1 & 2, Took's Court, London, E.C., and Published for the Proprietors at 84 & 85, Palace Chambers, Westminster, S.W.